



March 30, 2005

Chairman and Members of CIRM Site Search Subcommittee
California Institute for Regenerative Medicine
P.O. Box 99740
Emeryville, CA 94662-9740

Via: Melissa King

Dear Chairman and Members of the CIRM Site Search Subcommittee:

The City of San Diego is pleased to have submitted a strong proposal to bring the administrative headquarters of the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine to San Diego, the top life sciences center in the nation according to the Milken Institute.

The community of San Diego is deeply committed to the advancement of science and technology and is excited about working with the CIRM in transforming world-class life science research into successful, life-savings medical therapies. We are optimistic that you will agree that San Diego is the best location for the CIRM headquarters.

Our CIRM Readiness Team has continued to meet to prepare for that opportunity. As the City of San Diego's contractor for economic development services, EDC has led the proposal effort and it is on behalf of the City that we write this letter to help us gain a clear picture of the selection process and criteria.

EDC contacted Rebecca Donnachie at the Department of General Services (DGS) to request answers to a number of questions concerning "next steps" and she directed us to the CIRM website for answers. Unfortunately, the CIRM website does not have answers to our questions, and therefore we ask them in this letter and would greatly appreciate your response:

1. Bidders were advised that the proposals submitted as of the March 16 due date were essentially final offers and could not be subsequently modified.
 - a. We are assuming that no changes can be made to any proposals, including those that don't meet minimum requirements.
 - b. Will any proposal changes be allowed before the final site is determined?
 - c. If a change is made for one proposal, what will be the process for allowing other bidders to modify their proposals?

530 B Street
Seventh Floor
San Diego
CA 92101

2. In many of the State's RFPs, there is clear language indicating that, if a proposal is not responsive to the minimum requirements of the RFP, it is eliminated.
 - a. If a proposal does not meet the minimum requirements specified by the DGS RFP for the CIRM, is that site eliminated?
 - b. How will the Site Search Subcommittee determine which proposals will qualify for a site visit?

3. ICOC Chairman and Site Search Subcommittee Chairman Robert Klein suggested the possibility of two sites in a San Diego Union Tribune (March 20, 2005) "Q&A" session with editors, as follows:

Editor: Everybody assumes that it's going to be in the San Francisco Bay Area because of your personal ties.

Klein: "I don't think that's necessarily the solution. The board could even decide to break it apart and have the science in one area and the (administrative and business) functions in Northern California." It is our reading of the RFP that a single site is contemplated and that any discussion of two sites would require another RFP.

 - a. Would the ICOC please clarify its intent, including whether it would issue a new RFP to address the possibility of two sites?

4. On March 16, ICOC Chairman and Site Search Subcommittee Chairman Robert Klein said, "In an effort to stimulate and promote robust public participation in this process, we encourage all of the bidders to post their proposals, in their entirety, on their respective websites so that there is full and open access to them for the public." Some cities have declined to make their proposals public.
 - a. Will the ICOC Site Search Subcommittee or DGS make these proposals available by the next ICOC meeting on April 7th, or soon after via the CIRM website? EDC will be pleased to pay for all reproduction costs as well as overnight shipment if the ICOC decides to make hard copies available.

5. In many of the State's RFPs, weighting of the various proposal requirements is included in the RFP itself. No weighting was provided in the RFP for the CIRM.
 - a. Should we assume that all of the minimum requirements for both the Government Entity and the Building Owner are weighted equally?
 - b. The RFP also included "preferences" in addition to requirements. How are the RFP preferences weighted?

6. In order to ensure a fair and competitive procurement process, the State typically restricts communication between bidders and the evaluation committee members as defined in an RFP or other guidance.
 - a. Now that the proposals have been submitted, is there any prohibition in discussing the various proposals with ICOC Site Search Subcommittee members?
 - b. With other ICOC board members?

7. The ICOC has established an interim headquarters in Emeryville and begun to hire staff.
 - a. Are these people interim staff?
 - b. Would you provide bidders with the current list of positions filled and a current organization chart?

8. In the February 24, 2005 meeting transcript, the ICOC Site Search Subcommittee seemed to indicate that site visits will be conducted by "teams" of two ICOC Site Search Subcommittee members and that at least two teams will visit each finalist site.
 - a. Does this mean that each site visited will have two site visits instead of one? And, if so, will they be "back to back"?
 - b. What are the ICOC's expectations for each site visit? Specifically, what are the length of time, time of day, and the expectations of what will be accomplished during each site visit?
 - c. How are you determining which ICOC Site Search Subcommittee members will visit each site? Is the state's open meetings requirement the reason for dividing the Site Search Subcommittee into teams?
 - d. Will a DGS representative be included on each site visit?

9. For planning purposes and lead times to block participants' schedules, we would appreciate knowing the dates allocated for site visits even before the final sites are selected, as well as other key dates in the site selection timeline.
 - a. Who will be making the call to the selected cities? In San Diego, the call should be made to Jeff Kavar, Deputy Director of Community and Economic Development, 619 533 4234, or if he is not available, to Jane Signaigo-Cox, Senior Vice President of Economic Development at the EDC, 619 234 8484.
 - b. On what date do you expect to notify cities of site visits?

X

Chairman and Members of the ICOC Site Search Subcommittee
March 30, 2005
Page Four

10. What are the key dates for decisions by the ICOC?
 - a. Timeline for decision by the ICOC Site Search Subcommittee
 - b. Timeline for decision by the ICOC board

11. What is the role of DGS in the final decision and how might that affect the timeline?

We would like to suggest that, in the interests of keeping all bidders informed about the site selection process, at the ICOC Board Meeting on April 7th in Los Angeles, these questions be addressed. We respectfully request that, given the timeliness of reports from the Site Search Subcommittee, the Presidential Search Committee, and perhaps the Working Committees, these items be moved earlier in the agenda to ensure sufficient consideration.

On behalf of the City of San Diego, thank you for the opportunity to bid on this exciting headquarters project and for your prompt response to these questions.

Sincerely,



Julie Meier Wright
President & CEO

Cc: Mayor Dick Murphy
City Manager P. Lamont Ewell
CIRM Readiness Team
Rebecca Donnachie, Department of General Services