

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS

STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

ROBERT H. GALVIN, CHAIRPERSON

JULY 21, 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
JULY 21, 2009

1 . . .Verbatim Proceedings of a meeting of
2 the Connecticut Stem Cell Research Advisory Committee held
3 on July 21, 2009 at 1:00 p.m. at the Connecticut Economic
4 Resource Center, 805 Brook Street, Rocky Hill,
5 Connecticut. . .

6
7
8
9 CHAIRMAN ROBERT H. GALVIN: We have several
10 speakers, so we're going to get started. I'd like to
11 welcome Dr. Ronald Hart, we'll have some more to say about
12 him in a little bit. But we want to get into our agenda
13 and a presentation, reference Grant 06SCE01 from Dr.
14 Zhong.

15 MS. MARIANNE HORN: I wonder if we could
16 just do a roll call to start with, make sure that we have
17 a quorum here. Let's see, Dr. Arinzeh, are you on the
18 line? Dr. Canalis I believe was going to be absent.
19 Hello? Hello, Dr. Arinzeh? No. Dr. Fishbone?

20 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: Yes.

21 MS. HORN: Dr. Genel? Dr. Goldhammer is
22 absent. Dr. Hart is here, Dr. Hiskes is absent. Dr.
23 Kiessling are you on the line? Dr. Latham is on the line.

24 DR. STEPHEN LATHAM: Yeah.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 MS. HORN: Mr. Mandelkern is here but out
2 of the room at the moment. Dr. Nair? Hello? Paul
3 Pescatello? And Dr. Wallack is here. I don't believe we
4 have a quorum, one, two, three, four, five, we have six,
5 we need eight for a quorum since our committee is 14.

6 MS. CHELSEA SARNECKY: Well, I have Dr.
7 Pescatello as coming into the meeting, so maybe he's
8 running a bit late. Dr. Nair was going to be calling in,
9 and Dr. Arinzeh and Dr. Genel were going to be calling in
10 for the 1 o'clock.

11 MS. HORN: Who else is on the line? We
12 have Dr. Snyder and Steve Latham. Anybody else on the
13 line whose name I didn't call? Is the line working,
14 Steve?

15 DR. STEPHEN LATHAM: Yeah.

16 MS. HORN: Okay.

17 DR. WARREN WOLLSCHLAGER: Okay, can we talk
18 about creation of subcommittee, or do we need a quorum?

19 MS. HORN: No, we don't need a quorum, we
20 don't need a quorum. Has anybody else just joined us?

21 DR. MICHAEL SNYDER: It's Mike Snyder
22 again, I just got lost in the back lot.

23 MS. HORN: Okay.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: So we know the thing's

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 working.

2 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, maybe we can talk
3 about the subcommittees. We raised it a couple of times,
4 we don't need a quorum to move on this. And we talked
5 about this really in the context of just this problem here
6 where we have trouble getting a quorum.

7 And you know on some matters it could wait
8 another month or so. Some matters it can't when you have
9 money that's pending, the release to investigators, or
10 something like a reallocation of funds, something that has
11 at least the possible impact of impeding research.

12 And a lot of the stuff that we do that we
13 need quorums for are, you know they're important but
14 they're not so significant that necessarily have to be
15 brought forward to the entire group. So, we thought it
16 might be workable, and we've run this by the A.G.'s, we do
17 have the okay on this and we talked to C.I. as well. But
18 there is legal sufficiency, right Marianne --

19 MS. HORN: Yes.

20 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- to do this. That
21 we'd set up a three person subcommittee, a couple of them
22 actually, one for Yale and one for UCONN. And if we need
23 to mix and match for anything regarding Wesleyan, really
24 either committee can handle it. And the three persons

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 would be comprised of, at a minimum there'd be an
2 ethicist/attorney, a scientist, and then one other person.

3

4 And these subcommittees would be able to
5 handle all business that comes forward with the exception
6 of that work that they figure they can't handle. So, if
7 somebody came forward with a change in a reallocation of
8 budget, the subcommittees would handle it -- hi Paul.

9 If it was a change of PI, the subcommittee
10 could approve that on behalf of the entire committee.
11 With the caveat that any time they wanted to or felt it
12 necessary, the subcommittees could say this is beyond the
13 scope of our ability to handle, we want to refer this to
14 the big committee.

15 We wouldn't really have rotating members,
16 although they might rotate over time. Our thought was
17 that we'd actually appoint -- the Commission has the
18 authority to appoint members to these -- to committees.
19 So, we'd have a total of six people pre-identified, they
20 would then meet or have a scheduled meeting on this date
21 every month.

22 So, the -- what is it, the third Tuesday of
23 every month we'd either have a meeting of the full
24 committee, or scheduled meetings of the subcommittees.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 And so, as I said, both -- we thought it would be good, it
2 would save us problems with getting our work done in a
3 timely manner. It might save folks having to drive from
4 out of state for a meeting that can be done in an hour.

5 And so, I throw it out to the committee.
6 The Commissioner is on board with the concept, and so I
7 guess if we want to discuss it and see what folks think.

8 DR. LATHAM: Warren, you said the A.G.'s
9 office thinks that that's legally sufficient?

10 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Yes.

11 COURT REPORTER: Who's speaking please, I
12 need to know?

13 MS. HORN: Steve Latham.

14 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

15 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And that's -- Marianne
16 and I both met with Henry Salton on that, Steve. CI was
17 there as well.

18 DR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: I'm sorry, I missed
19 -- I was -- this is for procedural and --

20 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So that we don't have to
21 try to get together every month, you know, subcommittees
22 to do some of our work.

23 MS. HORN: Hi Mike. We'll get to -- hi,
24 welcome. We've got Dr. Genel.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So, maybe we can table
2 this discussion because some of the folks on line are only
3 going to be here for a short while and we want to make
4 sure we've got a quorum to get the business done. Is that
5 okay with you, Commissioner?

6 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah. Let's move on.

7 MS. HORN: We still don't have a quorum.

8 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Nair should be calling
9 in any moment.

10 MS. HORN: Okay. I've got Paul, yeah, we
11 need eight.

12 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And Michael. Mike
13 Genel.

14 MS. HORN: Okay, one, two, three, four,
15 five, six, seven --

16 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And Steve, eight. Are
17 you counting the Commissioner?

18 MS. HORN: No.

19 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Towards a quorum?

20 MS. HORN: No. Only voters.

21 DR. MILTON WALLACK: So, can we while we
22 wait, comment on this?

23 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: So anyway, yeah, so
24 let's see.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: I would think that frankly
2 it's -- I would think that's it's a very reasonable idea.
3 I would think that it's something we should pursue,
4 definitely.

5 DR. LATHAM: Yeah, this is Steve Latham, I
6 agree.

7 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, we did have, as I
8 say, if you -- if we're okay with the governance then
9 we're talking about making sure that we have a scientist
10 and an ethicist on each committee. So, that means Steve,
11 you'd be involved with the UCONN subcommittee --

12 DR. LATHAM: Right.

13 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- and Ann Kiessling, of
14 course, would be involved in the Yale Committee.

15 MS. HORN: Ann Hiskes.

16 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm sorry?

17 MS. HORN: Ann Hiskes.

18 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: I'm sorry, Ann Hiskes,
19 yes. And then --

20 DR. SARASWATHI NAIR: Hello?

21 MS. HORN: Hello.

22 DR. NAIR: I am Dr. Nair.

23 MS. HORN: Very good.

24 DR. NAIR: I am from Norwalk, Hospital of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 Norwalk, Connecticut.

2 MS. HORN: Welcome, thank you. You make
3 our quorum here.

4 DR. NAIR: Okay.

5 DR. WALLACK: Do you need a vote on that
6 because --

7 DR. WOLLSCHLAGER: No, without objection
8 the Commissioner is going to name people and we'll go back
9 to that later.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, we're going to
11 skip then to Dr. Zhong's presentation, item No. 4 on your
12 agenda, referencing 06SCE01.

13 MS. HORN: Which number is it?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: 4.

15 DR. WEIMIN ZHONG: I'll introduce myself
16 first. I'm Weimin Zhong, I'm an Associate Professor at
17 Yale. I've been at Yale since 1999 and my research
18 focuses on neuro (indiscernible) development. In
19 particular I'm looking at how stem cells -- neuro stem
20 cells pattern itself renew with differentiation --

21 DR. WALLACK: Could you just --

22 DR. ZHONG: Oh, there's another microphone?
23 So anyway, I'll start again. So, my name is Weimin
24 Zhong. I'm an Associate Professor at Yale in the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 Department of Molecular, Cellular, Developmental Biology,
2 not on the medical side, on the college side. And I've
3 been at Yale since 1999, so my research focuses is on
4 neurodevelopment in particular I'm looking at how neuro
5 stem cells, by themselves, renew and differentiation.

6 So, I have been involved in this grant from
7 the get-go last year. I guess we all discussed this, so
8 I'm very, very familiar with this particular grant. And -
9 -

10 MS. HORN: Dr. Zhong, I'm very sorry I have
11 to interrupt you and ask you to just put your presentation
12 on hold with respect to the quorum that we have hanging by
13 a hair here.

14 DR. ZHONG: Okay.

15 MS. HORN: And we have to go to item No. 5
16 and I apologize for that lack of direction. We need to
17 deal with 08-SCBUCHC06, change of PI from Bahr to LoTurco.
18 Chelsea?

19 MS. SARNECKY: Okay, so Dr. Bahr sent me a
20 letter dated June 9th, requesting to change the PI of this
21 project 08SCBUCHC06 to Dr. Joseph LoTurco. I'm sure you
22 all have read his letter, so I don't think I need to go
23 into much detail. But he did attach a revised budget and
24 he has attached the CV's for the PI who the project will

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 be going over to.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: A nice up-to-date CV, I
3 see.

4 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, very up-to-date CV.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, do we need
6 discussion on this matter?

7 MS. HORN: Yes, is there any discussion?

8 DR. JOSEPH LOTURCO: We're both here if you
9 have any questions.

10 MR. ROBERT MANDELKERN: Well, I'm a little
11 confused because we've been getting a lot of these where
12 the grants have been awarded and the PI's have been
13 changed reasonably after the grant has been awarded.

14 I'm not talking specifically about this
15 one, but as a matter of procedure if the PI is
16 entertaining a position elsewhere, as Dr. Bahr is and as
17 Dr. Snyder did, I think they should at least flag us early
18 in the process that they are entertaining other positions.

19 Because it's a little startling to you know, see a
20 proposal that was awarded to one researcher suddenly be
21 turned to another.

22 So, I'd just like us to be aware of that
23 because it's been happening somewhat regularly.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Dr. Fishbone?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. GERALD FISHBONE: I thought the
2 material submitted was excellent and it sounds like all of
3 the people who are taking over the project have been
4 involved in it, there's a lot of cross talk right from the
5 beginning. So, I was very impressed with the material.

6 I just had one question that I couldn't
7 quite understand, and that was in the CO-PI Filipovic and
8 I'm sure it's very obvious that I couldn't figure it out,
9 why she has two listings one for a three-month effort, the
10 second one for a two-month effort. Are these just
11 different times of the year that -- one for 30 percent,
12 the other is 100 percent.

13 MS. HORN: You need to come up to the
14 microphone, I'm sorry. And introduce yourself, please?

15 DR. LOTURCO: Sure. Joe LoTurco,
16 University of Connecticut. I'll be the PI taking over for
17 Dr. Bahr's component. And Dr. Bluphavich(phonetic) has
18 been in my laboratory.

19 It's an oddity of our academic accounting
20 system, I think, where we have some month appointment.
21 Rada has a 10-month appointment and then a two-month
22 appointment. Her salary from other sources covers her 10-
23 month appointment, and then she would be covered on this
24 with her two-month appointment, which is hard to

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 understand but it's part of the way our salaries come in.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Any other questions or
3 discussion?

4 DR. MICHAEL GENEL: Mike Genel. Can I move
5 acceptance?

6 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: So moved. Is there a
7 second to Dr. Genel?

8 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

9 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't get
10 any of that.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Mike Genel is
12 proposing and I think Steve seconded it as did Gerry
13 Fishbone. And the motion that's on the floor is to change
14 the PI and the grant as discussed. All in favor of the
15 change indicate by saying aye.

16 VOICES: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: And any opposition?
18 If not, the motion is carried and the primary investigator
19 is changed. Next, is item No. 6, 06SCA26, a no cost
20 extension to Dr. Carter's grant.

21 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Carter submitted a
22 letter to me on July 16th requesting a no cost extension
23 and a reallocation of funds for his project, 06SCA26. He
24 is requesting a change in the expiration date from

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 September 30th of 2009 to September 30th of 2010. So,
2 he's a requesting a year long no cost extension.

3 There is a remaining balance of funds,
4 \$71,000 -- about \$71,000 dollars of which he wishes to
5 reallocate to provide salary support for a graduate
6 assistant researcher. And he goes on in his letter to
7 explain in more detail what that money would be used for
8 and why he is requesting this year long no cost extension.

9 He also did attach a revised budget for this extension as
10 well, and a justification page.

11 MS. HORN: Did we just have somebody else
12 join us on the phone?

13 DR. TREENA ARINZEH: Dr. Treena Arinzeh.

14 MS. HORN: Excellent, welcome.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Dr. Wallack?

16 DR. WALLACK: It seems like a reasonable
17 explanation of why he needs the extension. And it seems
18 as though all other aspects appear to be on target. So,
19 at least from what I read, unless there's other
20 information that I'm not aware of, I would support the
21 extension, I move the extension.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Any other comments or
23 discussion? If not, would you make a motion to that
24 effect?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: I so move the extension.

2 MR. MANDELKERN: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: And seconded by Mr.
4 Mandelkern. All in favor of giving Dr. Carter a one year
5 no cost extension on his grant, indicate by saying aye.

6 VOICES: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Opposed? The motion
8 is carried. He has a one year extension on his project.

9 MS. HORN: Okay, and Dr. Latham you're
10 ringing off now?

11 DR. LATHAM: Yes, if that's all you need
12 for UCONN eligible voters?

13 MS. HORN: Yes, thank you so much for
14 taking the time to join us.

15 DR. LATHAM: Well, I'm very sorry to have
16 to ask you for special ordering and so on, I just have
17 other things I have to run do.

18 MS. HORN: Sure.

19 DR. LATHAM: But thank you very much for
20 accommodating me, and good luck with the rest of the
21 meeting everyone.

22 MS. HORN: Thank you. So, Dr. Canalis, are
23 you on the phone?

24 DR. ERNESTO CANALIS: Yeah, I can stay on

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 for a little while longer, it's okay.

2 MS. HORN: Dr. Genel, yes?

3 DR. GENEL: I am on the phone call, yes
4 that is correct.

5 MS. HORN: Wonderful, okay, terrific. We
6 are good to go.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Hi, Dr. Canalis, how
8 are you?

9 DR. CANALIS: Hi Commissioner, how are you?

10 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I'm good, are you far
11 away or just lowering your voice?

12 DR. CANALIS: I'm here, all ears.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, well thank you.
14 Okay, let's continue. We're on item No. 4 -- 7.

15 MS. HORN: We're going to get our votes
16 done and then we can --

17 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay 7, 09-SCBYALE14,
18 Dr. Huang, a budget reallocation.

19 MS. SARNECKY: Dr. Huang sent me this
20 letter June 29th. He's requesting a budget revision to
21 his award, 09-SBCYALE14 for the remainder of the grant
22 period. I -- you guys have read the letter I'm sure, but
23 just to reiterate, he's going to increase the materials
24 and supplies category from \$20,000 dollars to \$40,000

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 dollars per year for years one through four.

2 They determined that the category was under
3 estimated originally so that's where that change comes in.

4 And also, they wanted to add a 100 percent effort for a
5 post-doc associate in year one while decreasing the PI's
6 effort from 70 percent to 10 percent in year one, and from
7 10 percent to 5 percent in year two through four.

8 There are a few attachments that he
9 enclosed. The peer review, which stated that the
10 materials and supplies amount budgeted had been under
11 estimated originally. A justification page, and then the
12 budget revision -- or the budget reallocation page. And
13 the -- actually there' also a CV for Shuping Pang who will
14 be the post-doc associate in years two through four.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Comments and
16 discussion, please?

17 DR. FISHBONE: I have a question, Gerald
18 Fishbone.

19 DR. ARINZEH: With all the interference, it
20 is difficult to hear the discussion.

21 MS. HORN: Can everybody put their phones
22 on mute, there is a lot of clanging around in the
23 background.

24 DR. ARINZEH: This will allow us to join.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 MS. HORN: Wonderful, thank you. And Dr.
2 Genel this is a Yale application, so if you need to run
3 --

4 DR. GENEL: Yeah, I'm okay for the time
5 being. I'll let you know when I have to get off.

6 MS. HORN: Okay, very good, thank you.

7 DR. FISHBONE: I had a question about the
8 amount of time that the PI will be contributing to the
9 project. I think we've had discussions at previous
10 meetings that there was sort of a minimal amount of time
11 that we felt the PI should be involved in projects. And I
12 see that Dr. Huang is dropping down to 5 percent of his
13 time for years two through four. Is this considered to be
14 a reasonable amount of time for a PI?

15 MS. HORN: Dr. Hart? Any of the scientists
16 want to take that question? Is a 5 percent allocation of
17 time for a PI a reasonable amount of time?

18 DR. RONALD HART: The question is what else
19 is supporting salary for this person? Depending upon
20 exactly what they're doing, if they're getting paid by the
21 university or getting paid by the grants. That may be
22 quite reasonable that they can only allocate a very small
23 percentage to the project based on how much salary they're
24 pulling off of other sources. And really, in most cases,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 does not reflect the amount of time they spend on the
2 grant, unfortunately.

3 DR. ANN KIESSLING: -- decide what the PI
4 who can dedicate 5 percent on a given project.

5 MS. HORN: Ann Kiessling, I'm sorry. For
6 our Court Reporter, if people on the phone could identify
7 themselves before speaking that would be great.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: What did Ann say to do?

9 MS. HORN: Ann said it was not surprising
10 to have the 5 percent for a PI on a project.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I think that it's the
12 change that's a little startling, rather than the absolute
13 amounts.

14 DR. WALLACK: Yeah, I was just going to say
15 something similar, so I'll pick up on what you just said.

16 When we considered the grant, however, we were
17 considering it in a different context. And frankly, I
18 don't remember that when we okayed the grant how -- what
19 the dynamic of that conversation was.

20 But certainly, there was a different
21 consideration, so it may be okay, and a 5 percent
22 participation clearly was not what we anticipated as a
23 committee. I think that has to be addressed.

24 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I think there's

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 several changes, Milt. Chelsea, what are the other --
2 sorry --

3 MS. SARNECKY: That's okay.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Do you want me to jump
5 in? The significant change is in year one, where we're
6 going from a PI working with a post grad, but dedicating
7 70 percent of his time -- her time, I'm sorry, to that
8 effort. Instead in year one that dedicated time is going
9 to be reduced to 10 percent, and the post-doc is going up
10 to 100 percent.

11 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

12 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Now, this body already
13 approved years two, three, and four, an effort of 10
14 percent. That 10 percent is going to be reduced to 5
15 percent.

16 DR. HART: Let's also keep in mind that a 5
17 percent allocation from the PI trade off for a trade off
18 of 100 percent of a new post-doc probably means more
19 effort on the project.

20 MR. MANDELKERN: Dr. Galvin, Bob
21 Mandelkern. I went back and pulled the peer review on
22 this man --

23 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Hang on, Bob.

24 MS. HORN: We're really getting a lot of

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 interference, it sounds like somebody's at a race track.

2 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Ernie, are you at a
3 race track?

4 MS. HORN: If you have a mute on your cell
5 phone that would be terrific, thank you.

6 MR. MANDELKERN: This was one of the
7 outstanding established investigator grants with a score
8 of 1.75. And it received very good reviews from both
9 primary and secondary peer reviews. I'm -- you know, I
10 think it's an issue we have to reflect on because when we
11 grant the awards, are we granting simply the science --

12 MS. HORN: If someone has their phone not
13 on mute, would you please put it on mute?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Go ahead, Bob.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: I hope it's something we
16 have to consider in the future if there are possibilities
17 of the PI changing so quickly we should maybe put some
18 provision in the RFP or something. Because while the
19 science remains the same, and the objectives, and the
20 milestones, they have to be achieved by the post-doc
21 instead of an established investigator whom we granted the
22 \$500,000.

23 So, it's a difficult issue because if the
24 PI is saying the post-doc is qualified with 10 percent or

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 5 percent supervision, you tend to adhere to the wishes
2 -- her wishes. On the other hand, it's getting to be a
3 little too often, and it's like flaunting our committee.
4 You take a grant, and then as soon as something else
5 happens, you switch it to somebody you consider
6 worthwhile, but whom we haven't considered in the first
7 place.

8 So, I would support this based upon respect
9 for Dr. Huang, but I think in the future we should develop
10 some kind of policy on this because it is recurring
11 reasonably often.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Alright, I tend to
13 agree with you on that. I tend to think that if we looked
14 at the way the grant is today, it's one of those new
15 investigator grants.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: No, it's established.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, but it's -- if
18 you looked it at today you would say this is a new
19 investigator grant, and you got to go into that pool of
20 new investigator grants. But instead, we started off --
21 it sort of migrated from an established investigator over
22 into a post-doc, and wouldn't have gotten anywhere near
23 the funding.

24 If it had been a new investigator it would

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 have got a couple -- a \$200,000 dollar or less if the
2 original post-doc -- and so things happen and change and
3 are unpredictable. But I would think we'd have to come up
4 with some sort of a -- of policy among ourselves if this
5 is not going to be the norm.

6 DR. FISHBONE: Could I make a comment?
7 Gerry Fishbone. I think what Dr. Hart said is something I
8 hadn't really thought about, and that is it says amount of
9 time, but that seems to be more of who is paying for the
10 time and not reflecting necessarily the amount of time
11 that the person -- I haven't thought about it that way,
12 but it's a very good point.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, I think it's the
14 shift that's a little bit -- it goes -- you know it shifts
15 radically. And when grants shift radically then
16 -- I'm not a voter, but when I see a grant shifting
17 radically then I would be inclined to think this is not
18 what I voted for, this is something other than what I
19 voted for.

20 And then to -- for us to sit and try to
21 figure out what does this really mean in terms of payment
22 sources rather than supervision and ability to do the
23 grant, it interjects a whole lot of things and makes it
24 just impossible for us to appropriately consider the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 grant. But you know, once again I would say you know, if
2 I had seen the grant as it appeared today I'd say you know
3 you got to put it in with a new investigator.

4 And then you would only get \$200,000
5 instead of \$500,000. So, I think we need to do some
6 talking about this in the next iteration.

7 DR. HART: I have one more thing. Ron Hart
8 again. The real judgment I think of a grant project is at
9 two stages. One is when you're reviewing the proposal,
10 which is usually primarily a PI's doing, and then upon
11 renewal.

12 And essentially, anything that a PI can do
13 in the mean time to get the work done, get the science
14 taken forward, should be taken I think as a positive. And
15 so, it's a little hard here now to judge and to second
16 guess a PI on how they think they can advance the science
17 as quickly as they can. And that's I think just a note of
18 consideration to add.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Any further comment?
20 If not, I'll entertain a motion to accept the changes in
21 the grant as proposed. Do I have such a motion?

22 DR. FISHBONE: Can I have one more
23 question?

24 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Certainly, Gerry.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. FISHBONE: Where will the extra -- he
2 wants \$20,000 extra a year for supplies, where is that
3 coming from?

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: From the total reduction
5 in his time and effort.

6 DR. FISHBONE: Oh, her.

7 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Her.

8 MS. HORN: So, the bottom line of the grant
9 doesn't change.

10 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: From the persons.
11 Okay.

12 MR. MANDELKERN: Well, I would move the
13 acceptance of the application.

14 DR. FISHBONE: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, acceptance moved
16 by Mr. Mandelkern, seconded by Dr. Fishbone. All in favor
17 of accepting the changes as discussed indicate by saying
18 aye.

19 VOICES: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Opposed? None, the
21 motion is carried.

22 DR. GENEL: Commissioner?

23 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yes.

24 DR. GENEL: This is Mike Genel.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yes, Mike.

2 DR. GENEL: I voted on this obviously
3 because it's a Yale protocol, but one comment I might have
4 and that is that if we seriously want to consider changes
5 of this sort to change categorization, then I think it
6 should be in our next RFP.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I think that's
8 reasonable, Mike.

9 DR. GENEL: In other words, some sort of
10 statement that the -- perhaps that the Advisory Committee
11 maintains the -- maintains authority to change funding if
12 there's a substantial change in the intent or the --
13 intent, or the study, or the investigators. I'm not sure
14 I would want to do that, but I would say that -- in terms
15 of a process I think that would be the appropriate
16 process.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, I think you're
18 right. I remember I spoke with Henry Salton this morning
19 on another matter. But I recall when we were discussing
20 this, sort of the question was how much can you tweak an
21 existing grant before it becomes so tweaked it's not what
22 everybody voted on.

23 And that's where we got to enter these
24 percentages because you could theoretically, between year

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 one and year two alter personnel, and expenditures, and
2 perhaps even goals to the point where it would not be the
3 same as the -- as what had been voted on and may not have
4 been funded as amended and changed in the face of what
5 other grants were available at the time.

6 So, I think that's something we have to
7 look at and I think it's kind of ephemeral about you know,
8 how much can you change it and it still be substantial. I
9 think that's what Henry said to be substantially the same
10 as what we all voted on.

11 So, I think we need some discussion and
12 perhaps some inclusion of a statement in the RFP that we
13 reserve the rights to say if you change the grant
14 materially, then we have to re-think whether we're going
15 to continue.

16 DR. GENEL: Not in relation to anything --
17 nothing specific on this particular proposal, but just a
18 general commentary. And with that, Commissioner, my
19 meeting is resuming, so I will sign off.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Thank you for your
21 help.

22 MS. HORN: Thank you, Dr. Genel.

23 DR. GENEL: Thank you, bye.

24 MS. HORN: Okay. So, we have completed the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 business that needs that kind of a quorum. We can go back
2 to wherever you'd like to pick up.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: We have Dr. Zhong
4 patiently waiting, so we will let him resume his
5 presentation.

6 DR. ZHONG: I'll just continue. So, I
7 think -- so, first of all I want to restart by thanking
8 the committee for approving the funding for
9 (indiscernible) and also for approving the funding
10 (indiscernible) PI from Mike Snyder to myself. And so,
11 I'll just make a few quick points and then (indiscernible)
12 more than happy to answer it so that we change because
13 Mike Snyder has been approved to become the Chairman of
14 the Connecticut Department at Stamford and we, of course,
15 are really very sad that he is leaving. He really has a
16 high career at Yale and we never thought he would have
17 left.

18 And one thing I do want to emphasize is
19 that you know, Mike's negotiation as I understand it with
20 Stamford is being quite (indiscernible) so we were hoping
21 that at the end of the day that he will be during that
22 period, especially starting from late last year to the
23 beginning of this year when we kind of sensed there might
24 be a chance he would be leaving, we discuss among the PIs

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 because we do have regular meetings. You know, how much
2 impact it would have on this particular grant. So we
3 discussed about basically whether -- or how much it would
4 impact the research and who should be the PI in case he
5 leaves.

6 So, I had a discussion with Mike and we had
7 a meeting as I planned to right before he decided. So, we
8 did discuss this. And in the end, so we two
9 (indiscernible). One is that it impacts -- the research
10 itself should be very minimum because there will be a
11 transition period, even after Mike leaves. So the people
12 and the equipment will be dedicated to this particular
13 project. So, Mike is in charge of the -- in addition to
14 being the PI is also in charge of the (indiscernible) and
15 he is also in charge of (indiscernible).

16 So, basically the researchers who are doing
17 the work and the equipment will be left behind and Mike
18 will be able to direct the whole effort from Stamford.
19 So, it shouldn't be a problem, his part. The impact on
20 the other part, the other three projects, is very minimum.

21 So, the other one of course, who will be approved to take
22 over as PI, and in the end we decided on me because I was
23 involved in the grant from its conception part. So,
24 that's one.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 The other one is that the whole grant is
2 about studying integrating approach with the renewal
3 differentiation and among the four PI's, I am the new
4 biologist. So, we are making significant progress in our
5 two or three years. So, during the last year we really
6 need to discuss the (indiscernible) in more detail so
7 having me basically as the PI will be appropriate.

8 And just to throw in our revised budget,
9 I'll adjust to make sure that I really dedicated enough
10 time to really manage this grant for the last 17 months is
11 that I have increased my effort from 10 percent to 25
12 percent for the last year. So, what I really hope is that
13 we'll get this grant, you know, because we are really
14 making a lot of progress.

15 So, that's the main reason. And I
16 really apologize to the committee for not alerting the
17 committee earlier. The main reason is really Mike didn't
18 really decide until a month ago. And the minute we
19 decide, and we basically had a meeting and
20 (indiscernible). We probably should have alerted the
21 committee before we even made a decision that there might
22 be a change in (indiscernible) make matters a little
23 easier.

24 So, that's one issue I guess I would

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 like to say from the very beginning. And based -- the
2 bottom line really is that Mike is not going to reduce his
3 effort on this particular grant. His people will still
4 have an appointment, you know, a department as a research
5 scientist that's what we usually do.

6 So -- and also, you know in his case, and
7 it's not unusual for a scientist to move on, so they'll
8 actually customary in which you do maintain two labs and
9 two institutions to have a very, very smooth transition.
10 So, the short-term impact is really very, very minimum.

11 Of course, the long-term impact is Mike
12 leaving, is a huge loss to Yale and I would argue also for
13 Connecticut. He really is one of the most prominent
14 proteomic entinomics guy in the world. I saw a big
15 picture of him in Major today, and which is the most
16 prestigious journal.

17 So, that's what the kind of loss we are
18 dealing with. But hopefully, we can still pick his brain
19 in the coming years by calling him up. And he really
20 spent his entire career at Yale, so I'm sure he wants to
21 have connections with Yale. So, that's one.

22 The second issue the committee raised, and
23 I would like to explain, is the carry over from the
24 previous years. So, the total is somewhat wrong, \$350,000

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 on the direct cost and you add indirect costs, it's over
2 \$400,000. And the main reason is actually it reflects
3 actually how research works because -- so the second year
4 budget we pretty much spent what we have projected to
5 spend.

6 So, the carry over after two years is
7 really from the first year. Because for all four labs
8 working on human ear cells, this ear cell directed
9 research is really new. So, we need to assemble a new
10 team. So, in the first year we don't really spend all the
11 money budgeted for personnel and of course if we don't
12 have the full account of the people, then we don't use all
13 the supply budget.

14 So, the carry over mainly is from that --
15 from those, from year one basically. And so, I can
16 quickly go through the four -- the six components. So,
17 the first component is Proteomics Core, Genomics Core.
18 So, this is the one that's a lot of service. So, in the
19 first -- in year one the service of course, is minimum
20 because everybody has just started.

21 So, now we are having lots of service, not
22 just for ourselves, with what Mike is doing, with what we
23 are doing, but also to service the other researchers,
24 including those at Yale. And hopefully in the long run

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 we'll get people from UCONN and Wesleyan to use it too.

2 So, basically if you just look at how much
3 the money is being spent now, so you really see this huge
4 steam of picking it up. So, basically I think by the end
5 of the third year I'll be very, very surprised that there
6 will be money left. So, I think the carry over from the
7 genomics core will basically be used as more and more
8 people working on this thing, and this is really a very
9 unique core.

10 And also, I think you know, as the money
11 -- because we also -- so the genomics and the machines and
12 all these things, we actually have money from other sides
13 contributing to this. So, I think basically for the
14 amount of money we are spending on this we are actually
15 getting more things done because it's just you have the
16 machine there and other people contribute to it.

17 If the core has to buy everything using the
18 Connecticut money, we end up having to spend more money
19 doing the same thing. So, in the long run I do think as
20 the service picks up that's not going to be a big problem.

21 So, that's the proteomics core. So, the neuro core we
22 also -- yeah, go ahead.

23 DR. FISHBONE: The fee for service model,
24 what does that involve, and where does that money go?

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. ZHONG: Oh, so my understanding -- my -
2 - so, this is the NIH's regulation now. My understanding
3 is that every time you use it you charge a fee. Based on
4 that particular fee part of the person's salary will be
5 recovered from that fee.

6 So, originally we budgeted basically the
7 salary mostly from the grant. So, changing to this system
8 in the long run is beneficial because we can recover more
9 costs. But I think my understanding about accounting is
10 that because you are recovering part of it from the
11 service you provide, I guess whatever that's being
12 budgeted for the person as going to the supply category.

13 Meaning that we only pay the amount that we
14 cannot recover from the service. So, that's my
15 understanding of it, yeah.

16 DR. MICHAEL SNYDER: This is Mike Snyder.

17 DR. ZHONG: Oh yeah, Mike.

18 DR. SNYDER: I have a comment on that. So,
19 what I'll -- maybe I'll make an early comment. So, even
20 though I am departing, I totally think I will be very
21 actively engaged in this project until then. We be able
22 to save percentage time (indiscernible) and the people who
23 are involved in this project will stay at Yale. And I
24 will have an appointment at Yale for at least another

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 year, and I expect to be involved.

2 Just the last issue that Weimin brought up,
3 it used to be we could just pay part of the salary for the
4 individual grant. And that's how we did it before, we
5 paid salary based on a certain amount of effort towards
6 the project.

7 So, the (indiscernible) core would
8 pay would be partly paid from three different grants, one
9 which was the Connecticut Stem Cell Grant in proportion to
10 their effort on that project. NIH now has a model to let
11 you do that that you have to figure out how many dollars
12 that turns out to be. And then every time (indiscernible)
13 you pay on a per run basis, basically. So, it winds up
14 being the same money, it's just from a different
15 accounting mechanism.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Anything else, Mike?

17 DR. SNYDER: No, I think Weimin did really
18 well. From my view nothing has really changed. We need
19 more (indiscernible) PI because Weimin is a really
20 conscientious guy, that's why I want him as PI. It made
21 sense for an on site person to be PI, rather than me.

22 But otherwise the project is exactly the
23 same, we're all going to do our same projects, I think you
24 probably can appreciate the work's going incredibly well.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 We've have some nice papers last year, we've got a great
2 one submitted.

3 So, we're pretty excited about all the
4 science, that really hasn't changed at all, and I think
5 that next year it should even be more productive
6 (indiscernible) getting better and better with stem cell.
7 And I feel pretty good about it.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, any further
9 discussion? I may say somewhat parenthetically that we've
10 had a couple of discussions this afternoon about people
11 who moved on to other venues, and about very competent
12 people to continue the work.

13 You know, when you're being recruited by
14 "University Z" and you're at "University Y," you really
15 don't go out and tell everybody I think I'm going to leave
16 if I could just get the kind of deal that I want.

17 And so, some of this probably seems like it's more
18 abrupt than it actually is when -- the story that comes to
19 mind, I had a very bright classmate who was certain he was
20 going to get a departmental chairmanship at a prestigious
21 major medical school. And in fact, he was so certain he
22 published it in the alumni notes prior to his getting the
23 job and the appointment, which he did not get.

24 And it's kind of, I think, easier to make

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 sure you have you know, everything signed and the Board of
2 Directors has passed on you. So, I think we're going to
3 have this from time to time about somebody who says I'm
4 moving on. But they're not going to tell you when they --
5 listen I got a phone call from Duke last night and if they
6 give me the right kind of deal I'm history. That's not
7 going to happen.

8 So, we've got to be willing to accept some
9 of that. Now, do we need a vote on this?

10 MS. HORN: No, that was just for the
11 information of the committee.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay.

13 DR. WALLACK: One thing?

14 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yes, Milt?

15 DR. WALLACK: Some clarification. So, you
16 mentioned Dr. Lin?

17 DR. ZHONG: That's right.

18 DR. WALLACK: My original understanding is
19 that Dr. Lin was going to have an increased amount of
20 involvement with this grant, or was that inaccurate?

21 DR. HAIFAN LIN: Well, I always have been
22 very heavily involved in this. And obviously with Mike's
23 departure we are all trying to pull our weight. And I
24 think, obviously, I've been trying my best. And I think I

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 can speak that for Dr. Wiseman(phonetic) too, who I've
2 also conversed just a while ago.

3 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay. Anything else?

4 DR. WALLACK: I have another question. So,
5 I think this grant was a couple of years ago. So, I think
6 it was worth what, 3.2 million dollars? Is that right,
7 Mike?

8 DR. SNYDER: 3.8.

9 DR. WALLACK: 3.8.

10 MR. MANDELKERN: It's the largest grant
11 we've ever had.

12 DR. WALLACK: So, I guess from a poor boy
13 from the Bronx who had to budget every penny and watch my
14 parents budget every penny directly, there seems to be a
15 little bit of looseness, I think in the fact that -- and I
16 understand, I appreciate the presentation and the
17 explanation of where we're going to be at the end of this
18 coming year.

19 But somehow or other I would hope that --
20 and I'm just reflecting, I'm not criticizing, I'm just
21 reflecting on how I would like to be viewing these things.

22 And that is that I would like to see a little bit more
23 tightness. And we're not talking here about \$20,000
24 dollars or something, we're talking about a -- to me at

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 least, a substantial amount of money, 3 or 400,000 hundred
2 thousand dollars.

3 It's easy to say that amount, but if we
4 have to allocate that amount we're taking away from
5 something else. So, I know it's going to be used, but
6 it's not being exactly used the way we had -- at least I
7 had perceived at the outset, unless I'm misinterpreting
8 something.

9 So, again I'm not saying this to criticize
10 the presentation, which I thought was tremendously well
11 done. And (indiscernible) for you to come here to
12 approach this. But in reflecting upon going forward, I
13 think we ought to be alerted to ourselves, amongst
14 ourselves that we have to be very careful in how we read
15 those figures.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Go ahead Mike.

17 DR. SNYDER: Mike Snyder. I can comment on
18 that if you want.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Go ahead.

20 DR. SNYDER: I mean your first point taken,
21 I can assure you that nobody is tighter with money than
22 me. But I think we are really careful. I think
23 (indiscernible) it can change in the time we committed our
24 grant three years ago. (Indiscernible) the platform

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 that's (indiscernible) three years ago. You may recall
2 that the whole platform (indiscernible) came along and
3 basically we had to retool it and gear up for that.

4 And if we hadn't, quite frankly, we would
5 have been left behind in terms of the rest of the world.
6 So, it's sort of the nature of the beast unfortunately,
7 that you have to shift and you only put together the best
8 technologies and address the cutting edge. And these
9 things do shift quite a bit. And I think that's part of
10 what's going on in this case.

11 And so, I think that what you're saying
12 with carry over is part of that. But I think that will be
13 true of everybody's progress, their aims and their budgets
14 will shift a little bit over time because everybody has to
15 reevaluate and has the same cutting edge.

16 But I don't think it's a matter of
17 squander, I think it's really a matter of just adjusting
18 appropriately.

19 DR. ZHONG: I'll make a comment too. So, I
20 guess the easiest way is I'll go through all the six
21 components to see where the money -- so, we just dealt
22 with Mike's genomics core. So, for the neuro core we also
23 are running a carry over, and that again is because in the
24 first year we didn't include the technicians to really

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 provide a service.

2 And for this actually there's a very, very
3 good scientific reason for that. And this is more for
4 quality control than anything else, because we are
5 starting to differentiate human ear cells into neurons.

6 And one of the things we realized
7 very quickly is actually, you know, we cannot attract
8 some, you know, not well trained service person and just
9 say this is the protocol to follow and you get it. There
10 are lots and lots of quality controls. In the end it's
11 the quality of the cells we generate that really matters
12 to scientists.

13 So, we end up doing both -- on
14 (indiscernible) side and on my side, we actually devoted a
15 post-doc and (indiscernible) side to -- we actually
16 devoted in the first year a post-doc who actually will be
17 using these cells for the other projects to actually spend
18 time. And the one post-doc -- one research associate to
19 spend time, really get the protocols to work really really
20 very well.

21 So, that's one of the reasons we are under
22 using the money on the core side. But we are actually
23 spending money to really make sure we know how to do these
24 things. And the idea is that once we get (indiscernible)

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 it's much easier for us to recruit someone who are willing
2 to do the service job basically. And that's how -- so, in
3 the end we realized that's really the best way of doing
4 it.

5 So again, for that particular service we
6 have all the right people in place now, so those monies
7 will be used in the third year. And if you look at the
8 project over a three-year period, I think that's a much
9 better way of spending it than, you know, just grab
10 someone and say okay these cells look like neurons that we
11 just used, and that will hurt us in the long run.

12 So, that's for the neuro core. For Mike's
13 project that one basically runs a tiny, tiny -- like a
14 \$6,000 dollar deficit. So, that basically projects very,
15 very well with what Mike has projected. And for
16 (indiscernible) actually that's one of the good things
17 that he is running a surplus, because one of the students,
18 I forgot, one who got the fellowship from NIH.

19 So, the person will still be working on the
20 project, except that the money will not be used -- the
21 fellow will be not paid by the state. So, (indiscernible)
22 will be able to basically use the same money and recruit
23 an extra person to do the work.

24 And the other part of the component from

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 his side is that some of the things you pay up front, some
2 of the things you pay after things are done. So, part of
3 the debt will come from his -- (indiscernible) experiment
4 in which you pay afterwards. So, basically there's -- so
5 that's project 2.

6 For project 3, Dr. Weissman's project, I
7 think it's pretty much well projected. I think he has a
8 surplus of somewhere around \$20,000 dollars. So, for a
9 grant like this it's not unreasonable to have a surplus
10 somewhere around that region. And he is not -- and
11 basically -- the other thing is -- one thing Mike
12 mentioned, you know, Dr. Weissman's work we'll be dealing
13 with lots of these libraries, which are very expensive to
14 buy.

15 So, one of the things is that these
16 technologies have been developed by these companies. So,
17 in the end I think it's -- the way he re-budgeted, he
18 wanted to spend more money on these libraries because you
19 have better generation libraries come out. So, if we
20 don't go after the new generation of libraries in the long
21 run it will hurt us.

22 So, his budget -- re-budgeting is mainly on
23 this part, so he has the largest deficit as to why we want
24 to do things like this. So, for my part basically there

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 is a 50,000 dollar surplus. Again, you know the money is
2 really left over from year one in which we are starting to
3 recruit the researchers. And now we have three post-docs
4 in place and a big part of the money will go for that
5 extra person. We are not changing the supplies and we are
6 not changing the other part.

7 And the other portion goes to my own
8 increasing effort, because I really have to manage the
9 grant now. And so -- and the final years are the most
10 important years. I will just want to make sure I spend
11 enough time on this. The one thing -- you know, in the
12 end I think one of the comments made was correct that you
13 know the percentage is just how much money you get for
14 your salary.

15 But at the same time there's one way
16 to ensure that I can push away the other things is that
17 increase the salary from that pot. So, then I have no
18 choice put to push away the other parts and focus on this
19 one. So, that's the rationale for all the budget
20 reclassification.

21 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, and since we
22 deal with tax payer's money we have to ask these kinds of
23 questions.

24 DR. ZHONG: Oh, I completely understand.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: And we don't for a
2 minute want to constrain the wonderful minds that we have
3 working at Yale and at UCONN, these wonder nimble quick
4 minds that are moving on from one concept, which may be
5 outmoded, or not able to be applied to science onto
6 something else.

7 And it's a fast moving field, but we still
8 have to ask the questions about how come things are
9 changing because they are competitive grants and once
10 again, if the grant isn't the same as the one we
11 originally voted on, what about the people who didn't get
12 the money and who went down this pathway. So, we have to
13 ask a lot of questions.

14 You've made it very clear, you guys are
15 doing great work as your colleagues at Wesleyan and UCONN
16 are doing, and you've got to move fast. We, in my
17 department, we end up with money that we have to carry
18 over or try to carry over. Some of it is due to
19 inefficiency.

20 We just put an online licensing system in
21 and it just was more difficult that we thought it would be
22 and so we have -- we have almost \$360,000 we'd like to
23 carry over because we couldn't get the people and the work
24 in fast enough. We did it in four months, which is

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 unbelievably fast, but it just sometimes happens in
2 circumstances that requires to roll the money over.

3 Are we all set on this topic? Any further
4 discussion?

5 MR. MANDELKERN: I have one question. This
6 issue that's come up that the NIH is requiring a different
7 approach to the use of cores, my impression was when we
8 funded core No. 1 at Yale, core No. 1 at UCONN, and this
9 core now, and this genomics core, that the intent was to
10 train people, attract people, inspire people, and to use
11 the state money that established the cores to do that.

12 Now, is this fee for service now going to
13 apply to all cores, and does that not fundamentally change
14 what we established, that this is a very confusing part of
15 the presentation. Not that I am faulting the
16 presentation, I think it was excellent what you did, Dr.
17 Zhong. But this part of fee for service on cores that we
18 funded in the millions of dollars is not quite
19 understandable to me.

20 DR. SNYDER: Do you want me to comment on
21 that? I can.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, go ahead.

23 DR. SNYDER: This particular core, the
24 sequencing core, doesn't -- I mean, the state money

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 doesn't fund everything that goes on there and it's more
2 efficient to have (indiscernible) who runs the sequencing.

3 And she does it both for the Connecticut stuff and also
4 does it for other things. And that actually works out
5 quite well.

6 And there quite frankly isn't enough money
7 to have the (indiscernible) everything, than we do in
8 sequencing or if it (indiscernible) So, it was easiest to
9 switch to this particular model, it's a more efficient and
10 more cost effective way to do this.

11 I mean, if we (indiscernible) it will cost
12 quite a bit more. You may recall the University
13 contributed quite a bit of money toward the sequencing
14 machine as well.

15 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay.

16 DR. ZHONG: Yes, I have something to just
17 add on to what Mike just said. Because you know, these
18 calls are extremely expensive to set up. So there are --
19 I guess there are two ways of doing, you can have money
20 from one source setting up the entire thing, which would
21 be very, very expensive.

22 But also you can have money from three
23 different sources, NIH, Yale, and Connecticut. We can buy
24 more stuff, make the core much, much more efficient. The

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 only trade off, of course, in addition to people from
2 Connecticut, that we have to allow other people to use it.

3 But I think if you do a cost benefit analysis, I would
4 argue that having money coming in from different sources
5 and letting more people using it, will be far more
6 efficient. So, that's sort of the reason.

7 And then we -- once we do that then we have
8 to follow the rules. It's not the Connecticut rule that
9 applies, but also the NIH rules, and Yale's is probably
10 much more flexible. So, usually we try to get as much
11 money we can from Yale. But -- so, that's really the
12 reason why it's set up this way.

13 MR. MANDELKERN: And as an interesting
14 hypothesis that he wants to go forward with and hasn't got
15 the money for the fee, what happens to that research?

16 DR. ZHONG: That's a tricky question, yeah.
17 So, I guess it depends on you know, well this is
18 -- maybe we should do this off the record rather than on
19 the record. But in this case depending on -- I guess
20 there's a single -- as a scientist he's laughing too.

21 So, we have ways of going -- science is
22 really very, very interesting. It's always easy to
23 collaborate with someone. Part of collaboration is that
24 you're tapping the resource that the other person has.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 So, there are lots of ways of going through it, yeah.

2 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a question?

3 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Go ahead.

4 DR. FISHBONE: If the core gets funded
5 partially by the state and partially by the NIH, do you
6 run into any problems with the cell lines that can be
7 used, because now the NIH is funding part of that core?

8 DR. ZHONG: Yeah, so that's one of the
9 reasons -- actually I didn't mention is, after we got this
10 grant we realized that we do have this problem. So, we
11 did have Yale contribute into a portion of -- another
12 portion to this particular core. So, now we have two
13 sources which are not restricted by any federal regulation
14 in terms of which lines to use.

15 So, that should be fairly easy for us to
16 really do the accounting saying that you know, we'll use
17 this piece of equipment rather than that piece of
18 equipment that comes from NIH. So, that's not going to be
19 a problem.

20 DR. FISHBONE: Thank you.

21 DR. WALLACK: I have a feeling we're
22 winding down, so I just want to make this comment, and
23 that is that --

24 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: You're winding down or

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 we're winding down?

2 DR. WALLACK: And my observation is that
3 this is exactly how the system is supposed to work. I --
4 for what it's worth, I found the explanations that you've
5 given and that Mike has shared with us to be very, very
6 illuminating, number one.

7 Number two, I am very impressed that the
8 seriousness of the research and the researchers if -- in
9 that if I understand this correctly, because of the
10 important part of the research project you're saying
11 you're going to be devoting yourself not less but more to
12 this project. And that's encouraging from at least this
13 observer's perspective.

14 So, again from my own perspective I
15 congratulate you in being able to come to us and give us
16 the kind of explanation that you've given to us today.

17 DR. ZHONG: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, we're going to
19 move on. Marianne?

20 MS. HORN: Thank you. Thank you very much
21 for your presentation.

22 DR. ZHONG: Thank you very much for the
23 support.

24 MS. HORN: Okay, I'd like to formally on

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 behalf of the Commissioner and the Committee, welcome Dr.
2 Ronald Hart, and tell you a little bit about him. He is
3 Connecticut's graduate, a graduate of the University of
4 Connecticut. And I understand you still have family here
5 in the area?

6 DR. HART: Right.

7 MS. HORN: Graduate studies at the
8 University of Michigan in cellular and molecular biology.
9 And he is a Professor of Cell Biology and Neuroscience at
10 Rutgers. He is Associate Director of the W.M. Keck Center
11 for Collaborative Neuroscience also at Rutgers. And I
12 asked him to just say a little word about what he's doing
13 with stem cell research.

14 DR. HART: Okay, thank you. Well, first of
15 all thank you for having me. This is actually very useful
16 for me because I'm funded by the New Jersey State
17 Commission on Stem Cell Research. So, it's a real insight
18 into what goes on behind the scenes that we don't get to
19 see in New Jersey, it's not so public.

20 Anyway, my work at this point is focused on
21 small RNA genes, specifically microRNA genes early in
22 neurodevelopment from human stem cells. So, it's --
23 there's actually a number of projects, I'm sure in the
24 state that are very similar to what I've -- you know had

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 experience with.

2 And what's particularly useful this few
3 weeks is that with the new Obama stem cell rules I think
4 that it's really time for the state Commissions to think
5 about how they're going to fit into the you know, post-
6 Bush stem cell environment.

7 And I think it will be a very interesting
8 time over the next year to see exactly how the very
9 effective state Commissions can contribute to the overall
10 goals.

11 MS. HORN: That's wonderful. Well, your
12 expertise is very welcome, and I have my sights set on you
13 for us. We have an ethics and law subcommittee, and
14 that's one of the issues that I think we need to talk
15 about is what impact will the NIH guidelines have on our
16 program. Dr. Latham has agreed to Chair that committee
17 since Dr. Langwith has stepped down, so we'll be in touch.

18 But thank you very much.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Item 3 is approval of
20 the minutes from the June meeting. And you've all
21 received a copy of those minutes, please peruse them if
22 you have not already. And I'll give you a minute to do
23 that and then we will discuss any changes, additions, or
24 deletions.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 Everybody had a chance to look at the
2 minutes of that meeting? And if so, I will seek a motion
3 to approve the minutes.

4 DR. FISHBONE: So moved.

5 MR. MANDELKERN: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, Gerry, Bob
7 Seconded. Are there any discussion about the -- we're
8 speaking about item 3, the approval of minutes from the
9 June, 2009 meeting. Anything that you want to change,
10 clarify, delete, add to? If not, I'll call for a vote.
11 Yes?

12 DR. WALLACK: I don't know if you want to
13 discuss this as part of the minutes or as other business.
14 For example, on page 3 there was a discussion having to do
15 with the fact that we perceived the need to make sure that
16 all of the monies were out by June 30th. And there were
17 two grants that were being somewhat held up because of IRC
18 and escrow approvals. Do you want to have this question
19 asked now, Bob, or later or --

20 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Well, I think we can
21 ask Chelsea if all the grants have --

22 MS. SARNECKY: Yes, all the grants have
23 received --

24 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: They're all out.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. WALLACK: So, those two that were in
2 question are all --

3 MS. SARNECKY: Everything's all set and the
4 money's all -- so we're all set.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: So, the point of the
6 discussion was that we did not want to have money lying on
7 the table during a time when there was a rather frantic
8 scrambling for every dollar. So, we wanted to get the
9 money out where it belongs, and it's out where it belongs
10 so that I don't think it's an issue anymore, Dr. Wallack.

11 DR. WALLACK: Okay, good.

12 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, now we're going
13 to vote on item 3, simply the approval of the meeting
14 notes from the June, 2009 meeting. All in favor of
15 approval indicate by saying aye.

16 VOICES: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Opposed? There are no
18 opposing votes. The minutes as supplied to you are
19 approved. Other business? Is there any other significant
20 business?

21 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, we still had a
22 couple of unresolved issues, one which was the
23 subcommittees, but we can make those appointments
24 afterwards.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: We can do that, okay.

2 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And I don't think we got
3 to item -- did we get to the final annual reports?

4 MS. SARNECKY: That's actually a very
5 quick, short update. We received --

6 MR. MANDELKERN: What number?

7 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: No. 8, Bob.

8 MR. MANDELKERN: Oh, okay.

9 MS. SARNECKY: Dan and I had received the
10 2006 grants, they're final reports. So, the grants that
11 were for two years, we've received their final reports. I
12 don't know if Dan had discussed this with you, or I can't
13 even remember if I had. There's no voting action at this
14 point because they're the final reports, so I think what
15 we're going to do is just put them on the password
16 protected site that we've sent around previously. Just
17 put up all the final reports there.

18 I can send you guys the password, and you
19 can look at them at your leisure. And if you did have
20 anything that jumped out at you that you wanted to bring
21 back to the committee for discussion I think that would
22 probably be the easiest way to go about doing that.

23 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: And we had talked about
24 it, Chelsea. Just one thing we were going to do for the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 committee is extract certain end of grant information,
2 like numbers of publications, that sort --

3 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

4 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- whether or not there
5 were any pending patents or anything like that so we could
6 provide a summary for 2006.

7 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay. Yes?

8 DR. WALLACK: One other thing. Our
9 Advisory Committee annual report, not the report from the
10 (indiscernible), there was going to be -- it was going to
11 be amended with an executive summary indicating the
12 economic impact?

13 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: All set, it's on our
14 website if anybody wants to see it.

15 DR. WALLACK: Alright, thank you.

16 MR. MANDELKERN: One question, Chelsea.

17 MS. SARNECKY: Yes.

18 MR. MANDELKERN: What about the cores that
19 we funded in '06? Is there any progress report or are you
20 just talking about --

21 MS. SARNECKY: I'm just talking about the
22 ones that have ended. The projects for 2006 that have
23 ended --

24 (loud ringing)

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: That's horrible
2 whoever's doing that. Okay.

3 DR. WALLACK: One other new business.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yes.

5 DR. WALLACK: Does the Chair have any
6 consideration now of when we're going to start the RFP
7 process for 2010? Because I would think that we'd
8 probably want to go on the early end rather than the late
9 end.

10 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Our intent was actually
11 to begin working -- we, DPH, working with CI. We've got
12 to tweak it based on a lot of what's happened in the last
13 year, and try to come back with some kind of a product to
14 this group at a September meeting. Of course, with the
15 caveat, I mean, I don't think we should wait to see what
16 happens with the final budget. I wanted to proceed as --
17 so that's not too much different than previous years' time
18 frames.

19 DR. WALLACK: So, you're saying that the
20 September meeting is when you would be ready to offer us
21 that information for us to consider going forward for
22 2010. Do you think that might be -- well, maybe it's
23 impossible to even get accomplished is that the August
24 meeting, which is our next meeting, I would assume --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 we're not having an August meeting?

2 MS. HORN: No.

3 DR. WALLACK: We're not having an -- okay,
4 so September is the next time we can do that? Okay.

5 MS. SARNECKY: I think, too, Milt, if you
6 have any suggestions that you come across, as well as
7 everyone else on the committee, feel free to send them
8 along to me and Marianne, and I can incorporate them into
9 the RFP prior to showing it to you guys at the September
10 meeting.

11 So, I think I would assume how the process
12 would work is, if anyone had any comments forward them
13 onto me or Marianne. We can hash those out between CI and
14 DPH. We can give you guys our version of the RFP at the
15 September meeting --

16 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Well, maybe you can get
17 it you before the September meeting so we can act on it
18 --

19 MS. SARNECKY: Yeah, as soon as we finish.

20 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: -- in September? That
21 might save us a month.

22 MS. SARNECKY: Yeah.

23 DR. WALLACK: So, that's a good idea, but
24 can we send an email to the Advisory Committee to that

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 effect --

2 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

3 DR. WALLACK: -- since some of them are not
4 at this meeting?

5 MS. SARNECKY: Sure.

6 DR. WALLACK: And one of the things --

7 DR. ANN KIESSLING: Now that this topic has
8 come up I have a couple of suggestions to make. Is this
9 the time?

10 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Go ahead.

11 DR. KIESSLING: One of the things I'd like
12 us to consider this round is including some set aside
13 funds for what in California they're calling clinical
14 dream teams. And I don't think it should occupy, you
15 know, a huge percentage of it.

16 But, if you go to see our own website, I
17 think you'll see a description of the teams that they've
18 begun to fund that are actually combinations of clinical
19 teams and basic science teams in an effort to speed the
20 translation of the basic science discoveries.

21 And I think it's very effective, and would
22 be a really good thing for some of the work that's going
23 on in Connecticut if the investigators and clinicians
24 could afford to pull together and really get serious about

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 it. And the goal of the California clinical translation
2 team is to develop a project that will be ready for FDA
3 safety trials within four years.

4 MR. MANDELKERN: Is that a new category?

5 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: It would be a new
6 category of grant.

7 DR. KIESSLING: I just threw that out for
8 discussion because I think it's a way to really promote,
9 first of all, to the citizens of Connecticut the
10 seriousness with which we're hoping you know clinical work
11 is going to come along. And also if everybody could start
12 thinking about that rather than continuing their wonderful
13 basic science work.

14 DR. WALLACK: Ann, do you have any idea in
15 California what percentage of the annual allocations they
16 set aside, what percentage?

17 DR. KIESSLING: I can find that out. It's
18 actually a lot of money for these teams. And they set
19 aside -- they set it aside as a totally separate funding
20 category. And they've done the review process in a
21 slightly different way.

22 They first have these teams provide letters
23 of intent. And because this was a decent amount of money,
24 I think we're talking about you know, two or three million

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 dollars apiece, some of them were even larger. They had
2 us review letters of intent to kind of rule out the
3 projects that the science advisors didn't really think
4 could make it to FDA level in four years.

5 So, that they can simply focus on full grant
6 applications from teams that looked like they had some
7 clinically, either a little bit of testing already or some
8 clinically savvy ideas that probably would be ready for
9 FDA safety trials in four years.

10 These are not approval trials, these would
11 just be FDA safety trials. But it was -- it really
12 stimulated the entire California community to kind of get
13 their act together.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Well, I think there's
15 certainly a feeling among us all that we'd like to see the
16 science progress to the point where there was some
17 potential application, at least somewhere on the horizon.
18 I'm not sure that, without rereading the law and its
19 intention, that that fits quite underneath the rubric of
20 what we were originally chartered to do.

21 And I would caution the group, this is not
22 a good time to go forward to the legislative body and ask
23 them to change something -- something with us that we're
24 certainly -- this is -- we spent a lot of money, we don't

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 fly under the radar, as the often used phrase. But we
2 certainly wouldn't want to do anything that triggers a
3 major hard look at what we're doing.

4 I personally think that we'll be very, very
5 fortunate to have 10 million dollars to spend this
6 -- the '09/'10 year, however you wanted to view it. I
7 think it's a distinct possibility that there may be a
8 reduction in the amount of money spent, if not an ending
9 of the whole spending cycle because of how desperate the
10 budgetary stuff is.

11 So, I think we may want to very carefully
12 consider what we can do, and ask our attorney advisors
13 about what we can do and still stay on the soccer field
14 that we defined for ourselves four years ago. We really,
15 really don't want a hard look at what we're doing and say,
16 can't you do it for half as much, or since the initial
17 phase is over and you funded all these cores, you don't
18 need 10 million, you only need 4. So --

19 MS. HORN: I'd be happy to take a look at
20 what California is doing and maybe put together something
21 for the committee to react to.

22 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah.

23 DR. KIESSLING: I mean, this was still
24 definitely defined in California as stem cell research,

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 that it was research that was really targeted to a very
2 specific point, and so it involved some clinicians. It
3 wasn't a change in their position.

4 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, my concern is
5 you don't want somebody in the legislative body to say hey
6 they're doing something different there. We should take a
7 closer look at this.

8 DR. KIESSLING: I understand. I don't see
9 how it would be defined as different. I mean, I don't
10 feel it would be interpreted as that. I also would like
11 to point out that California, the CIRM was very, very
12 worried about their funding too.

13 And I think California's crisis is pretty
14 well known, that somehow they've gone through all their
15 funding. They are funded at exactly the level they had
16 hoped to be this year for the next two years.

17 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, but we barely,
18 barely preserved the funds this year, you know? The
19 Governor had to intervene at one -- on one occasion to get
20 them back. I don't know how Governor Schwarzenegger does
21 it, I know how Governor Rell does it, and it was a very
22 tough struggle to preserve the 10 million this year.

23 DR. PAUL PESCATELLO: I would just make the
24 comment that -- I'm pretty sure that the legislation

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 certainly talked about therapies and cures, and also for
2 profit enterprise that the funds were available. So, I
3 think the legislation was pretty clear that the goal was
4 to find therapies and cures, as well as that the money
5 should be available to for profit enterprises.

6 So, I would be surprised if we couldn't do
7 something like that. But having said that, I think it's
8 really important to -- that we play to our strengths in
9 Connecticut. And I think our strengths as I've come to
10 learn about the stem cell community, really is basic
11 research. I don't see a translational -- I haven't seen a
12 lot of translational things going on.

13 I certainly, from my own limited
14 experience, it's really hard to force -- people -- look at
15 the war on cancer begun 40 years ago, how much money has
16 been put into that. To try to force something -- you sort
17 of can't force science, it has to be based on a foundation
18 of basic research.

19 DR. KIESSLING: Right, right, Paul is
20 speaking, correct?

21 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yes.

22 DR. PESCATELLO: Yes.

23 DR. KIESSLING: Right, so Paul what are the
24 -- my throwback to that is that I was very surprised at

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 the type and the caliber of applications California was
2 really organized was able to pull for this particular RFA.

3 And I realized that they have substantially deeper
4 pockets than Connecticut. But I've come to realize that
5 translational medicine happens when it is funded in --
6 when that's the RFA.

7 So, I think clinicians and basic scientists
8 will have a much more -- are much likelier to have lunch
9 together if there's a carrot dangling out there, than if
10 they just continue to go into their own parallel track.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I would agree with
12 that. Mr. Mandelkern?

13 MR. MANDELKERN: Thank you, Dr. Galvin.

14 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: You're welcome.

15 MR. MANDELKERN: I would like to continue
16 the theme of playing to our strength. I think we should
17 reflect that each year we put out RFP we've gotten request
18 for funds approximately 10 times the amount of available
19 funding. And in that process we've been very selective
20 and we had actually to turn away very good proposals down
21 with scores of 2 last session.

22 And there is some -- there is some clinical
23 work if you will recall, not this funding cycle the
24 previous one, we funded over a million dollars, Dr. Redman

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 from Yale School of Med, Parkinson research. And the peer
2 reviewers both said if this final piece of Dr. Redman's
3 research is successful it is ready, willing, and able to
4 go to clinical trials, which would be the first human
5 clinical trials in Parkinson disease in the United States.

6
7 So, we are aware that -- I am, at least,
8 that clinical trials are there with a little bit more
9 success in the research. And to change what has been
10 attracting scientists to Connecticut and has been an
11 outstandingly successful program based on part of reviews
12 we've gotten and the magnificent front page coverage we
13 got in the largest circulation in the state paper this
14 last week, I think we should appreciate we're making
15 tremendous progress under the format.

16 Though I hesitate to disagree with my
17 esteemed colleague, Ann Kiessling, I think Connecticut has
18 done for three million people, better than California has
19 done for 35 million.

20 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay.

21 DR. HART: One comment. The other
22 consideration is you're thinking about any changes at all,
23 if there were to be any changes at all in any strategies,
24 is again the change in federal situation. There's now

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 much, much less restriction on Federal funding of stem
2 cell research. And so, suddenly this huge drawing card of
3 bringing researchers to Connecticut is gone.

4 So, it's an issue to consider as well, that
5 there's a way to play state funding as either pilot funds,
6 as core facilities, as enticements in other ways to garner
7 more federal support for these researchers.

8 The other -- the last piece of that, I'm sorry, was
9 that the idea that this would be a carrot for
10 translational research. If you were to play it
11 appropriately, I think that's absolutely true. If an RFP
12 were issued asking for some path toward translational
13 medicine, someone would appear with a great idea, you just
14 know it.

15 DR. PESCATELLO: Doesn't there have to be a
16 company, though, a for profit company -- I mean, I'm not
17 aware of clinical trials that are done by Universities. I
18 mean, something that's going to be translated into a
19 medicine, into a product, it requires you know, tens to
20 hundreds of millions of dollars for clinical trials. I'm
21 not aware of that occurring outside of a for profit
22 company doing that --

23 DR. KIESSLING: No, it certainly does occur
24 and especially with a state run safety trial.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 DR. PESCATELLO: Right. But that's usually
2 just a safety trial.

3 DR. WALLACK: Just as a reminder for the
4 committee, we in fact last year did modify the request for
5 applications, and we in fact did include in the request
6 the idea that we would entertain grants, we'd grant
7 requests that involved translational work.

8 We did that last year, and I just thought
9 that it would be appropriate for the record to put that
10 back out there that we should -- and I would imagine will
11 continue to be interested in seeing those kinds of
12 applications coming forward.

13 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I believe we actually
14 included that in the goal statement.

15 DR. WALLACK: Right.

16 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: I can't see anybody
17 other than Pharma doing that, can you Paul?

18 DR. PESCATELLO: I guess I'm -- my hunch is
19 that people who are in Biotech has a pretty good nose for
20 what has potential. And if there isn't that interest
21 there, I'm kind of suspect. You know, they're watching
22 very closely the basic research that's being --

23 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah, you'll hear from
24 them as soon as you've got a product, you know, on the

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 horizon.

2 DR. KIESSLING: We'll also be able to get
3 some benefit from what happens -- exactly happens in
4 California because what projects are going to be funded
5 will be posted on their website I think by August.

6 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: We speak closely with
7 California, as well.

8 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Okay, any further
9 discussion? Yes?

10 MR. MANDELKERN: If I recall this last
11 funding session we had a request for funds from a
12 commercial company, I forget the name exactly at the
13 moment, working in brown and white fat cells, which got
14 scored very well and was doing clinical trials, and we
15 didn't choose to fund it.

16 So, that is going on in our program
17 already. Huber I think was the name of the CEO, I forget
18 the name of the company. It scored very well, but we
19 didn't have sufficient funds to go all the way around.

20 DR. FISHBONE: Could I ask a question,
21 which may be self evident. On a slightly different topic,
22 we have funded some grants for four years, and some for
23 three, and two. Have they received all of that money, so
24 that if we don't get more money next year that does not

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 affect --

2 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: That money's fenced.
3 It's contractually obligated.

4 DR. FISHBONE: Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: So, somebody can't say
6 gee, Gerry Fishbone's got a grant and it's a four million
7 dollar, four-year grant, and he's only spent two so we're
8 going to grab the other two because we're desperately
9 short.

10 DR. FISHBONE: So, it is -- yeah.

11 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: But you can't touch
12 that, it's -- that would be a violation of the contract.
13 So, everybody who's got -- that's why we wanted to get it
14 out so quickly. So, everybody who's got a signed contract
15 their money is safe. It's what happens to the next 10
16 million bucks that we're concerned about.

17 DR. FISHBONE: And one other quick
18 question, if we get requests to fund research in stem --
19 in nuclear transfer, or pathogenesis, we can still fund
20 that, right, even though it's not approved?

21 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah. Any public
22 comment? Okay, if not there is nothing else on the
23 agenda, I will --

24 DR. WALLACK: Before you adjourn --

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Yeah.

2 DR. WALLACK: -- just so that we all know,
3 the UK is involved, and I have copies of this, if you need
4 it for the minutes I'll provide it to Marianne. Involved
5 in doing research that within a period of 10 years will
6 make -- I don't know how you're all going to take this,
7 make males unimportant to society. So that for what it's
8 worth, and I know there's a lot of males sitting around
9 the table --

10 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Good.

11 DR. WALLACK: -- because the whole sperm
12 thing from stem cells, so that might --

13 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: My office staff
14 already feel that way. Did you have anything else?

15 MR. WOLLSCHLAGER: Just to show you that
16 good people come from Meriden, Connecticut. Not on the CV
17 and not mentioned, but Dr. Hart was born and raised in
18 Meriden.

19 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: Well, at least one --
20 well at least 50 percent of us are good. And we
21 appreciate Dr. Hart's coming up and get him on the road at
22 a decent time. Thank you all for attending. May I have a
23 motion to adjourn?

24 DR. WALLACK: So moved.

MEETING RE: STEM CELL RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
JULY 21, 2009

1 CHAIRPERSON GALVIN: We stand adjourned.
2 MS. HORN: See you in September, thank you.
3 (Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at
4 2:28 p.m.)