

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

BEFORE THE  
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND  
THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE  
TO THE  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: MAY 17, 2021  
12 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR  
CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2021-11

**133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864  
208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM**

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

**I N D E X**

<b>ITEM DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<b>OPEN SESSION</b>	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	
3. CONSIDERATION OF NEW APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	5
4. CONSIDERATION OF EDUC SPARK CONCEPT PLAN.	9
5. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR EXISTING ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS AWARDEES.	39
6. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH, AND APRIL 2021 ICOC MEETING MINUTES.	46
7. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH PROJECTS PROGRAM	49
<b>CLOSED SESSION</b>	
NONE	
8. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM 7 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)).	
<b>DISCUSSION ITEMS</b>	
PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE
ADJOURNMENT.	96

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MONDAY, MAY 17, 2021; 12 P.M.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU,  
EVERYBODY. WELCOME TO THE MAY 17TH REGULARLY  
SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE ICOC AND THE APPLICATION  
REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. HOPE EVERYONE IS ENJOYING THIS  
MID-SPRING. MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. DAN  
BERNAL. GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

DR. BOXER: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.

DR. BRASHEAR: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE  
DULIEGE.

DR. DULIEGE: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

MS. DURON: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.

DR. FINE: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.  
2 DR. GASSON: HERE.  
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.  
4 DR. GOLDSTEIN: HERE.  
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
6 DR. HIGGINS: HERE.  
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
8 MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.  
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.  
10 DR. LEVITT: HERE.  
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.  
12 DR. MALKAS: HERE.  
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
14 DR. MARTIN: HERE.  
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
16 DR. MIASKOWSKI: HERE.  
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
18 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.  
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE  
20 PANETTA.  
21 MR. PANETTA: HERE.  
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.  
23 MR. ROWLETT: HERE.  
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.  
25 DR. SELICK: HERE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.

2 DR. STAMOS: HERE.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. WE'LL COME  
4 BACK TO OS. JONATHAN THOMAS.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

7 MR. TORRES: HERE.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

9 DR. VUORI: HERE.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON. DIANE  
11 WINOKUR.

12 I'M GOING TO GO BACK TO OS. OS, ARE YOU  
13 THERE? I KNOW I SAW YOU. OKAY. WE HAVE A QUORUM.  
14 THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. GO  
16 STRAIGHT TO THE ACTION ITEMS FOR TODAY'S AGENDA.  
17 FIRST UP, CONSIDERATION OF NEW APPOINTMENTS AND  
18 REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. GIL.

19 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.  
20 SO GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYONE. SO WE ARE BRINGING FOR  
21 YOUR CONSIDERATION SOME NEW NOMINATIONS FOR  
22 APPOINTMENT AS WELL AS REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE GRANTS  
23 WORKING GROUP.

24 AND SO OF THE FOUR NEW NOMINATIONS, OUR  
25 GOAL IN MAKING THESE RECRUITMENTS WAS TO FOCUS ON

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FILLING GAPS FOR OUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. AS YOU  
2 MAY BE AWARE, WE'RE ISSUING RFA'S ON SPARK, BRIDGES,  
3 RESEARCH TRAINING. SO WE WANT TO ADD ADDITIONAL  
4 MEMBERS THERE, ALSO TO DIVERSIFY OUR GRANTS WORKING  
5 GROUP AS WE ENGAGE IN THIS. SO WE IDENTIFIED FOLKS  
6 IN THIS SPECIFIC COHORT FROM HBCU'S AS WELL AS SOME  
7 LATINO SURVEYING INSTITUTIONS THAT I THINK WILL HELP  
8 ROUND OUT OUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.

9 JUST TO QUICKLY REVIEW THE NOMINEES, DR.  
10 RENATO AGUILERA FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS EL  
11 PASO, WHICH IS MY ALMA MATER. SO GLAD TO HAVE HIM  
12 NOMINATED. DR. RUBY BROADWAY FROM DILLARD  
13 UNIVERSITY. DR. KAREEN COULOMBE FROM BROWN  
14 UNIVERSITY. DR. CHECO RORIE, FROM NORTH CAROLINA  
15 AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL STATE UNIVERSITY.

16 FOR REAPPOINTMENTS, WE HAVE DR. MICK  
17 BHATIA, DR. DOUG EATON, DR. ANTHONY HOLLANDER, DR.  
18 MARGO MAYER-PROSCHEL, DR. THEO ROSS, AND DR. ROBIN  
19 WRIGHT, WHO ARE ALL BEING REAPPOINTED FOR SIX-YEAR  
20 TERMS.

21 AND SO WE'RE SEEKING APPROVAL OF THESE  
22 NOMINEES FROM THE BOARD. MR. CHAIRMAN.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. HOLD ON ONE  
24 SECOND, GIL. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS, FIRST OF ALL,  
25 BEFORE WE GET TO THE NOMINEES THAT GIL HAS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MENTIONED? I WANT TO ADD CHRISTINE AS WELL, WHO IS  
2 JOINING THE GWG AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBER. SO  
3 THANK YOU, CHRISTINE, VERY MUCH.

4 ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT ANY OF THE BOARD  
5 MEMBERS OR GWG MEMBERS THAT GIL HAS PROPOSED? WE  
6 HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?

7 MS. DURON: SO MOVED.

8 DR. MARTIN: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY, SOUNDED LIKE,  
10 YSABEL AND SECONDED BY DAVE MARTIN. ARE THERE ANY  
11 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS ON THIS ITEM FROM MEMBERS OF  
12 THE BOARD? ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?  
13 HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU CALL THE ROLL PLEASE.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. DAN  
15 BERNAL. GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

16 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

18 DR. BOXER: YES.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.  
20 DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

21 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

23 MS. DURON: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.

25 DR. FINE: YES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.  
2 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.  
4 DR. FLOWERS: YES.  
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.  
6 DR. GASSON: YES.  
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.  
8 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.  
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
10 DR. HIGGINS: YES.  
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
12 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.  
14 DR. LEVITT: YES.  
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.  
16 DR. MALKAS: YES.  
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
18 DR. MARTIN: YES.  
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
20 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.  
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE  
22 PANETTA.  
23 MR. PANETTA: YES.  
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.  
25 MR. ROWLETT: YES.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.  
DR. SELICK: YES.  
MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.  
DR. STAMOS: YES.  
MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN  
THOMAS.  
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.  
MR. TORRES: AYE.  
MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.  
DR. VUORI: YES.  
MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON. DIANE  
WINOKUR.  
THE MOTION CARRIES.  
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO  
ITEM NO. 4, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF THE SPARK  
CONCEPT PLAN. KELLY SHEPARD WILL PRESENT.  
DR. SHEPARD: HI, MARIA. DO I HAVE  
PERMISSION TO BEGIN SHARING MY SCREEN?  
MS. BONNEVILLE: YES, PLEASE DO.  
DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU. LET ME GET THIS  
SET UP. CAN EVERYBODY SEE THAT?  
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON,  
MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CIRM TEAM. I'M HERE TO PRESENT FOR YOUR  
2 CONSIDERATION TODAY A RENEWAL FOR THE SPARK PROGRAM  
3 CONCEPT UPDATED FOR 2021 AND BEYOND.

4 THE SPARK PROGRAM IS AN ACRONYM FOR THE  
5 SUMMER PROGRAM TO ACCELERATE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
6 KNOWLEDGE. BEFORE I GO INTO THE NEW CONCEPT, LET ME  
7 JUST BEGIN BY BACKING UP A LITTLE BIT AND GOING OVER  
8 THE FACT THAT CIRM HAS MADE A NUMBER OF INVESTMENTS  
9 ACROSS FIVE CORE PILLARS.

10 NOW, THE THREE DEPICTED AT THE TOP, THE  
11 DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND CLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS,  
12 REPRESENT OUR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO.  
13 HOWEVER, CIRM HAS ALSO FUNDED AN EDUCATION AND  
14 TRAINING PORTFOLIO OF PROGRAMS AS WELL OVER THE  
15 YEARS BEGINNING FROM HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL STUDENTS  
16 WHERE REALLY THE GOAL IS TO INTRODUCE THEM TO THE  
17 OPPORTUNITY AND THE EXCITEMENT IN THE FIELD OF  
18 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND THE POTENTIAL THAT IT  
19 OFFERS AS A CAREER, TO UNDERGRADUATE AND MASTER'S  
20 LEVEL PROGRAMS CREATING A TECHNICAL WORKFORCE, AND  
21 TO PH.D., POSTDOCTORAL, AND CLINICAL FELLOW PROGRAM  
22 TO CREATE FUTURE LEADERS IN THE REGENERATIVE  
23 MEDICINE FIELD.

24 MORE SPECIFICALLY, THESE HAVE FALLEN INTO  
25 THESE THREE CORE INITIATIVES. THE RESEARCH TRAINING

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 AWARDS, WHICH WAS ACTUALLY THE FIRST FUNDED  
2 INITIATIVE THAT CIRM OFFERED BACK WITH THE PASSAGE  
3 OF PROPOSITION 71. IT FOCUSED ON TRAINING  
4 PREDOCTORAL, POSTDOCTORAL, AND CLINICAL FELLOWS.  
5 AND THERE WERE 940 OF THOSE CIRM SCHOLARS TRAINED  
6 OVER A PERIOD OF NINE NEARS.

7 THE SECOND MAJOR TRAINING INITIATIVE,  
8 WHICH IS STILL ACTIVE AT THIS TIME, ARE THE BRIDGES  
9 AWARDS, WHICH FOCUS ON TRAINING UNDERGRADUATE AND  
10 MASTER'S LEVEL STUDENTS.

11 AND THEN, OF COURSE, THE SPARK AWARDS,  
12 WHICH WE'LL BE TALKING ABOUT TODAY WHICH FOCUS ON  
13 HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL TRAINING.

14 NOW, WE DID BRING CONCEPTS TO RENEW THE  
15 RESEARCH TRAINING AND BRIDGES PROGRAMS TO YOU IN  
16 FEBRUARY, AND THAT WAS APPROVED AT THE TIME. AND WE  
17 MENTIONED THAT WE WOULD BE BRINGING BACK THE BRIDGES  
18 PROGRAM CONCEPT FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION IN THE NEAR  
19 FUTURE. THAT NEAR FUTURE IS TODAY.

20 SO JUST A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND ABOUT  
21 THE SPARK PROGRAM IN PARTICULAR. SO AS I NOTED,  
22 CIRM HAS OFFERED FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES TO SUPPORT  
23 TRAINING AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN STEM  
24 CELL-BASED RESEARCH THROUGH OUR EDUCATION PROGRAMS,  
25 WHICH WE ABBREVIATE AS EDUC. HISTORICALLY CIRM HAS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SUPPORTED HIGH SCHOOL INTERNSHIPS THROUGH TWO  
2 DIFFERENT REQUESTS FOR FUNDING OR RFA'S. THE  
3 ORIGINAL WAS CALLED THE CREATIVITY AWARDS. THAT RFA  
4 WAS ISSUED IN 2011, AND A REVISED VERSION OF THAT  
5 PROGRAM WAS ISSUED IN 2015, AND THE PROGRAM WAS  
6 RENAMED SPARK AWARDS.

7 FOR THE PURPOSES OF MY PRESENTATION, I'M  
8 JUST GOING TO REFER TO THIS ENTIRE PROGRAM AS SPARK  
9 ALTHOUGH THE NAME DID CHANGE IN 2015.

10 AS WAS THE CASE THEN AND NOW, FEDERAL  
11 FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL RESEARCH  
12 TRAINING, PARTICULARLY IN STEM CELL RESEARCH, ARE  
13 LIMITED AND DISPARATE. CIRM IS PROPOSING TO  
14 RELAUNCH THE SPARK AWARDS, EDUC 3, TO ALLOW  
15 CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL RESEARCH  
16 TRAINING IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. WE WILL BE  
17 PROPOSING SOME MODIFICATIONS TO THE SPARK CONCEPT,  
18 HOWEVER, TO YOU TODAY TO BRING THE PROGRAM INTO  
19 ALIGNMENT WITH PROPOSITION 14 OBJECTIVES AND TO  
20 BETTER REFLECT THE PRESENT CHALLENGES AND  
21 OPPORTUNITIES. AND I WILL BE GOING OVER THOSE IN  
22 MORE DETAIL IN MY PRESENTATION.

23 FIRST, I WANTED TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE BIT  
24 OF CONTEXT ABOUT THE SPARK PROGRAM, WHICH HAS BEEN  
25 GOING ON SINCE 2012, AND SOME OF THE OUTCOMES TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DATE.

2 SO THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS PROGRAM HAS  
3 REALLY BEEN TO PROVIDE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH  
4 HANDS-ON TRAINING IN STEM CELL RESEARCH THROUGH  
5 SUMMER INTERNSHIPS AND TO INSPIRE THEIR INTEREST IN  
6 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. THESE PROGRAMS ARE  
7 STRUCTURED BY SUPPLEMENTING AND INTEGRATING WITHIN  
8 WHAT WERE EXISTING SUMMER PROGRAMS SPONSORED BY  
9 ELIGIBLE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS, BUT WITH A FOCUS  
10 ON REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. AND AS I MENTIONED, THERE  
11 WERE TWO RFA'S IN THE PAST THAT SUPPORTED THIS  
12 PROGRAM, THE TC 1 GRANTS, WHICH WERE THE CREATIVITY  
13 AWARDS, AND THE EDUC 3 GRANTS, WHICH ARE THE SPARK  
14 AWARDS MOST RECENTLY ISSUED IN 2015. THOSE WERE  
15 FIVE-YEAR AWARDS, AND THE LAST OF THOSE PROGRAMS ARE  
16 ENDING THIS SUMMER.

17 HISTORICALLY THERE HAVE BEEN TEN OF THESE  
18 HIGH SCHOOL INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS SPONSORED ACROSS  
19 CALIFORNIA. YOU CAN SEE THEM DEPICTED HERE ON THE  
20 MAP. CURRENTLY SEVEN OF THEM ARE STILL ACTIVE, AS I  
21 MENTIONED, THROUGH THE END OF THIS SUMMER.

22 NOW, WHILE EVERY ONE OF THESE PROGRAMS IS  
23 A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT AND UNIQUE TO ITS  
24 INSTITUTION, THEY ALL HAVE SOME CORE FEATURES IN  
25 COMMON, WHICH IS WHAT MAKES THEM SPARK AWARDS. SO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THEY ALL INVOLVE SOME PREPARATORY COURSES AND  
2 WORKSHOPS THAT TAKE PLACE AT THEIR HOME  
3 INSTITUTIONS, AND THEN THE STUDENTS GO ON TO PERFORM  
4 A FULL-TIME SUMMER RESEARCH INTERNSHIP IN A  
5 LABORATORY BASICALLY FULL TIME FOR ABOUT EIGHT  
6 WEEKS.

7 IN ADDITION TO THESE PROGRAMS, THE  
8 STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN SPECIAL ACTIVITIES WHERE  
9 THEY HAVE SOME DIRECT INTERACTIONS WITH PATIENTS AND  
10 DO SOME COMMUNITY OUTREACH THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA,  
11 WHICH AT THEIR AGE THEY'RE ALL VERY GOOD AT. AT THE  
12 END OF THEIR SUMMER INTERNSHIP, THEY ALL COME  
13 TOGETHER FOR AN ANNUAL CONFERENCE. SO ALL OF THE  
14 SPARK STUDENTS ACROSS THE STATE COME TOGETHER, THEY  
15 PRESENT THEIR RESEARCH ON POSTERS WITH ONE ANOTHER  
16 AND THEIR PARENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES AND THE CIRM  
17 TEAM AND CELEBRATE THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS TOGETHER.

18 SO SINCE THIS PROGRAM WAS INITIATED AND  
19 THE FIRST GRANTS BEGAN IN 2012, THERE HAVE BEEN 480  
20 STUDENTS WHO HAVE COME THROUGH THIS PROGRAM. NOW, I  
21 DO WANT TO MENTION THAT WE BEGAN -- THESE PROGRAMS  
22 HAVE ALWAYS SUBMITTED ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS TO  
23 TELL US HOW THINGS WENT OVER THE YEAR; BUT IN 2015  
24 WE WERE ABLE TO START ACTUALLY TRACKING SOME OF THE  
25 OUTCOMES AND LONGER TERM OUTCOMES OF THESE STUDENTS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WHO HAVE COME THROUGH THE PROGRAM.

2 SO WHILE I DON'T HAVE A DATASET FOR THE  
3 COMPLETE 482 STUDENTS, WE DO HAVE DATA FROM A LITTLE  
4 OVER 200 OF THEM BEGINNING IN 2015. AND SEVERAL OF  
5 THESE TRAINEES ARE ACTUALLY STILL IN HIGH SCHOOL  
6 BECAUSE THEY DO THEIR INTERNSHIPS DURING THEIR  
7 SOPHOMORE OR JUNIORS YEARS. AND MANY OF THOSE WHO  
8 HAVE GONE ON TO COLLEGE ARE STILL ACTUALLY IN  
9 COLLEGE. HOWEVER, I DO HAVE DATA FROM 171 ALUMNI  
10 WHO REPORTED COLLEGE ATTENDANCE. AND 40 PERCENT OF  
11 THOSE ARE ACTUALLY ATTENDING UNIVERSITIES OF  
12 CALIFORNIA THROUGHOUT THE STATE, 26 PERCENT OF THEM  
13 ARE ATTENDING ANOTHER SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA SUCH AS  
14 STANFORD, CALTECH, OR A CAL STATE UNIVERSITY, AND  
15 ABOUT A THIRD OF THEM ARE ATTENDING SCHOOLS OR  
16 UNIVERSITIES OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA, INCLUDING SOME  
17 IVY LEAGUE COLLEGES YOU SEE LISTED THERE. OF 141  
18 WHO HAVE DECLARED MAJORS, 96 PERCENT OF THEM HAVE  
19 DECLARED MAJORS IN BIOLOGY OR A CLOSELY RELATED STEM  
20 FIELD.

21 JUST TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE BIT MORE COLOR  
22 ABOUT THIS, I PUT THE ATTENDANCE OF CALIFORNIA  
23 COLLEGES ON THE LEFT PIE CHART AND THOSE ATTENDING  
24 COLLEGES OUTSIDE ON THE RIGHT. AS YOU CAN SEE ON  
25 THE LEFT WITH THE BLUE SHADING, THOSE ARE ALL THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS. AS I MENTIONED,  
2 THE MAJORITY OF ALUMNI WHO ARE ATTENDING COLLEGE IN  
3 CALIFORNIA ARE ATTENDING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
4 SCHOOLS, ALTHOUGH THERE'S A SIZABLE PORTION  
5 ATTENDING STANFORD AND CALSTATE UNIVERSITIES AS  
6 WELL. AND YOU CAN SEE ON THE PIE CHART ON THE RIGHT  
7 THAT ABOUT 40 PERCENT OF THE STUDENTS ATTENDING  
8 COLLEGE OUT OF STATE ARE ACTUALLY ATTENDING IVY  
9 LEAGUE SCHOOLS.

10 DR. MARTIN: MAY I ASK A QUICK QUESTION  
11 ABOUT THESE DATA? DO YOU HAVE NUMBERS ON HOW MANY  
12 OF THE -- WHAT FRACTION, WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE  
13 STUDENTS, PARTICIPANTS, WHO HAVE GRADUATED FROM HIGH  
14 SCHOOL IN THE LAST, SAY, YEAR AND A HALF HAVE  
15 ATTENDED COLLEGE? I'M JUST WONDERING WHAT THE  
16 DROPOUT RATE DISTRACTIONS, PROFESSIONAL SPORTS  
17 CANDIDATES, ET CETERA.

18 DR. SHEPARD: I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT  
19 NUMBERS OF THAT, BUT I CAN TELL YOU THAT OF THE 171  
20 THAT I'M SHOWING YOU HERE, THIS WAS DATA FROM ABOUT  
21 215 ALUMNI. AND THE NUMBERS THAT I WAS NOT ABLE TO  
22 DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THEY WERE IN COLLEGE, MOST  
23 OF THEM WERE STILL IN HIGH SCHOOL, AND THERE WERE A  
24 FEW THAT WE JUST DON'T KNOW ABOUT. I HAVE TO SAY  
25 THIS PROGRAM HAS ACTUALLY BEEN DORMANT FOR OVER A



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 YEAR BECAUSE IT WASN'T ABLE TO BE OFFERED LAST YEAR  
2 BECAUSE OF THE COVID RESTRICTIONS. AND SO THESE  
3 DATA THAT I HAVE ARE FROM THE END OF 2019. AND WE  
4 ARE HOPING TO GET AN UPDATE WHEN THE NEXT PROGRESS  
5 REPORTS COME IN AT THE END OF THE SUMMER. AS FAR AS  
6 I CAN TELL, THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THESE STUDENTS ARE  
7 GOING ON TO COLLEGE AFTER THEY GRADUATE.

8 DR. MARTIN: WE WOULD CERTAINLY HOPE SO.  
9 GREAT. THAT'S WONDERFUL. WE SHOULD LOOK CAREFULLY  
10 AT WHAT HAPPENED WITH THOSE WHO MAYBE HAVE NOT,  
11 WHETHER THEY HAVE A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR  
12 CONTINUING THEIR EDUCATION.

13 MS. DURON: I HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT  
14 DEMOGRAPHICS THAT YOU MAY HAVE IN YOUR PRESENTATION,  
15 OR SHOULD I ASK THEM NOW?

16 DR. SHEPARD: I DON'T HAVE ANY SLIDES ON  
17 DEMOGRAPHICS. I HAVE LOOKED OVER THE INFORMATION  
18 THAT WE HAVE ABOUT THEM, AND I CAN PROBABLY ANSWER  
19 SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT.

20 MS. DURON: SO OBVIOUSLY WOULD LIKE A  
21 BREAKDOWN FROM RACIAL/ETHNIC MINORITIES. AND THE  
22 OTHER THING I'D LIKE TO KNOW IN TERMS OF THE  
23 PARTICIPATING HIGH SCHOOLS THAT THEY COME FROM, IF  
24 YOU'RE ABLE TO DETERMINE AND ACCESS THAT, THESE ARE  
25 IN LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES, WHERE THEY COME FROM,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THESE SCHOOLS WHERE THEY MIGHT NOT NECESSARILY BE  
2 OFFERED THIS OPPORTUNITY, AND WHETHER AND WHAT WE  
3 ARE DOING ABOUT THAT. WE CAN DISCUSS THAT LATER,  
4 BUT I'D CERTAINLY LIKE TO SEE WHERE THEY'RE COMING  
5 FROM, IF ALL SCHOOLS ACROSS CALIFORNIA ARE GETTING  
6 THE INFORMATION SO THAT KIDS WHO MIGHT BE FABULOUS  
7 SCIENTISTS IN THE FUTURE DON'T EVEN KNOW THE PROGRAM  
8 EXISTS AT THIS STAGE OF THEIR HIGH SCHOOL CAREERS.

9 DR. SHEPARD: ABSOLUTELY. I DON'T HAVE  
10 THAT INFORMATION IN FRONT OF ME TODAY, BUT WE DO  
11 TRACK THE HIGH SCHOOLS THAT ALL THE STUDENTS ARE  
12 COMING FROM. SO WE HAVE THAT INFORMATION, AND WE  
13 CAN REPORT THAT TO YOU AT ANY TIME.

14 SO THE WAY WE TRACK THIS INFORMATION IS,  
15 ONCE THESE GRANTS ARE ISSUED, WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN,  
16 THEY BECOME ACTIVE AND THE PROGRAMS BEGIN RECRUITING  
17 THE STUDENTS IN THE WINTER, USUALLY BEFORE THE  
18 SUMMER THEY DO THEIR INTERNSHIPS. ONCE THE STUDENTS  
19 ARE RECRUITED INTO THE PROGRAM, THE GRANTEES FILL  
20 OUT WHAT'S CALLED AN APPOINTMENT FORM. AND THIS  
21 GIVES US THE NAME OF THE STUDENT AND THEIR HIGH  
22 SCHOOL, THEIR BIRTH DATE, AND IT ALSO ASKS FOR SOME  
23 DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION. IT IS ALL OPTIONAL. SO  
24 THE INFORMATION THAT WE HAVE IS ALL SELF-REPORTED.  
25 I AM ABLE TO GENERATE A LIST OF ALL THE DIFFERENT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 HIGH SCHOOLS AND THE STUDENTS AND WHAT HIGH SCHOOLS  
2 THEY CAME FROM. WE DO NOT COLLECT AT THIS TIME  
3 SOCIOECONOMIC INFORMATION ON THE APPOINTMENT FORM.  
4 SO I CAN'T REALLY SPEAK TO THE STATUS OF THAT;  
5 HOWEVER, I DO BELIEVE, IF YOU READ THE GRANTS, THEY  
6 ARE VERY FOCUSED ON TRYING TO RECRUIT DIVERSE  
7 COHORTS, AND THAT'S A MAJOR GOAL OF THESE PROGRAMS.  
8 AND I CAN TELL YOU A LITTLE BIT ABOUT SOME OF THE  
9 DEMOGRAPHICS FROM THE REPORTED DATA IF YOU ARE  
10 INTERESTED IN HEARING THAT NOW. DID YOU WANT ME TO  
11 DISCUSS ANY OF THAT NOW?

12 MS. DURON: COULD GIVE US A QUICK RUNDOWN  
13 ESPECIALLY BECAUSE WE ARE ALWAYS TALKING ABOUT  
14 PIPELINE, AND WE'RE CREATING THE OPPORTUNITY FOR  
15 PIPELINE. AND, IN FACT, IF WE'RE NOT REQUIRING  
16 CERTAIN DATA TO BE COLLECTED, THEN WE'RE NOT REALLY  
17 HELPING TO ADVANCE OUR ARGUMENT FOR OR AGAINST.

18 DR. SHEPARD: I LOOKED AT THE DATA THAT  
19 WAS REPORTED ON APPOINTMENT FORMS FOR 411 OF THE  
20 APPOINTMENT FORMS. FEMALE TO MALE IS 65 PERCENT  
21 FEMALE AND THE REMAINDER INDICATED MALE. FOR  
22 ASIAN-AMERICAN, IT WAS 55 PERCENT; AFRICAN-AMERICAN  
23 10 PERCENT; MULTIRACIAL, 9 PERCENT; WHITE, 17  
24 PERCENT; PACIFIC ISLANDER, A LITTLE MORE THAN 1  
25 PERCENT. AND FOR ETHNICITY, WE HAVE 41 PERCENT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 LATINO OR HISPANIC AND ABOUT 60 PERCENT NON. SO  
2 THOSE ARE THE CATEGORIES THAT I WAS ABLE TO GLEAN BY  
3 LOOKING AT THE DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FROM WHAT WAS  
4 SELF-REPORTED.

5 MS. DURON: WELL, I THINK AT SOME POINT IN  
6 TIME WE REALLY NEED TO LOOK AT IF, IN FACT, SOME OF  
7 THE UNDERREPRESENTED SCHOOLS ARE ACTUALLY GETTING  
8 INTO THE MIX AND WHAT ARE THE ANSWERS TO MAKE SURE  
9 THAT THEY'RE RAISING THE ISSUES AMONGST THEIR KIDS  
10 AND TRYING TO HELP THEM MOVE INTO THESE SPONSORING  
11 COLLEGES, ET CETERA, ET CETERA.

12 I THINK WE NEED TO DO AS MUCH AS WE CAN TO  
13 SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE PIPELINES OUT OF  
14 UNDERSERVED SCHOOLS.

15 DR. SHEPARD: VERY MUCH AGREE. AND MANY  
16 OF THE DISCUSSIONS THAT THE BOARD HAS BEEN HAVING  
17 OVER THE PAST FEW MONTHS ON IMPROVING OUR ABILITY TO  
18 TRACK AND MONITOR FOR DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND  
19 INCLUSION, THAT'S PART OF THIS PROGRAM AS WELL, AND  
20 I WILL BE GOING OVER THAT WHEN I DISCUSS THE NEW  
21 CONCEPT. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY MORE QUESTIONS  
22 ABOUT THAT AS I CAN AS WE GO THROUGH THAT.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: KELLY, CAN I JUST ANSWER  
24 IN PART YSABEL'S QUESTION ANECDOTALLY? SO, YSABEL,  
25 ART AND I PRETTY MUCH EVERY YEAR GO TO THE POSTER

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SESSION THAT IS AT THE END OF THE PROGRAM WHICH IS  
2 PERENNIALY ONE OF OUR FAVORITE EVENTS. HOLD ON.

3 (INTERRUPTION IN PROCEEDINGS.)

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'VE BEEN ON MUTE THE  
5 WHOLE TIME. THE DOG JUST KNOWS WHEN YOU PUT IT BACK  
6 ON TALK WHEN TO START ACTING UP.

7 SO AS I WAS SAYING, THIS IS PERENNIALY A  
8 WONDERFUL EVENT. I CAN REPORT THAT ONE OF THE  
9 THINGS THAT IS SO STRIKING ABOUT THE GROUP EVERY  
10 YEAR IS THE DIVERSITY AND MAKEUP OF THE KIDS, WHICH  
11 IS VERY SUGGESTIVE OF THE FACT THAT WE ARE GETTING A  
12 TREMENDOUS REPRESENTATION FROM ALL DIVERSE  
13 COMMUNITIES WHICH IS PRECISELY WHAT YOU WANT.

14 SIMILARLY, WITH THE BRIDGES PROGRAM. IT'S  
15 ONE OF THE THINGS, AS KELLY SUGGESTED, THAT WE  
16 CERTAINLY EMPHASIZE AND THE PROGRAM MANAGERS AT EACH  
17 OF THE SPONSORING INSTITUTIONS DOES AS WELL. SO I  
18 THINK WE ARE DOING A VERY GOOD JOB ON THAT.

19 I DO ECHO, YSABEL, YOUR IDEA THAT WE  
20 SHOULD BE GETTING MORE SPECIFIC DATA ON THE HIGH  
21 SCHOOLS OR COMPILE IT TO PRESENT, AND KELLY WILL DO  
22 THAT. SO JUST WANTED TO LET EVERYBODY KNOW THAT.

23 MS. DURON: I APPRECIATE THAT, JONATHAN.  
24 SO THOUGH TO DAVID'S POINT ABOUT FALLOUT OR DROP-OFF  
25 BECAUSE I THINK THE CHALLENGES IN SOME LOW-INCOME

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 COMMUNITIES AND FOR THE STUDENTS WHO COME OUT OF  
2 THESE PROGRAMS ALL ALONG THEIR CAREER TRAJECTORY AND  
3 THROUGH COLLEGE, THEY, BOTTOM LINE, NEED SOME  
4 SUPPORT. OTHERWISE, THEY TOO FALL OUT OF THIS  
5 WONDERFUL PATH THEY'RE ON.

6 SO I'M JUST WONDERING IF SOME WAY, SOMEHOW  
7 ALONG THE WAY -- I SEE WE TRACK WHERE THEY GO TO  
8 SCHOOL MAYBE, BUT DO WE LOSE SIGHT OF THEM OVER  
9 TIME, OR DO WE HELP THEM WHEN THEY MIGHT BE HAVING  
10 PROBLEMS STAYING IN SCHOOL? JUST OTHER THOUGHTS  
11 THAT MIGHT BE CONSIDERED BY KELLY ALONG THE ROAD IN  
12 TRYING TO MAKE THIS A SUPER SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM  
13 BECAUSE I THINK IT'S FABULOUS.

14 DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU, YSABEL. WE ARE  
15 THINKING ABOUT THOSE THINGS AS WELL BECAUSE, AS YOU  
16 KNOW, WE ARE SUPPORTING TRAINEES ALONG THE STAGES OF  
17 THE PIPELINE. AND WE DEFINITELY SEE DIFFERENCES IN  
18 THE DEMOGRAPHICS AS PEOPLE PROGRESS THROUGH. AND I  
19 THINK NOW THAT CIRM HAS GOTTEN SOME EXPERIENCE IN  
20 MANAGING SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS, IN THE LONGER TERM  
21 WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO GET A REAL BETTER  
22 UNDERSTANDING, AT LEAST WITHIN OUR OWN PROGRAMS,  
23 WHERE SOME OF THE ATTRITION MIGHT BE HAPPENING AND  
24 WHAT MORE WE CAN DO TO TRY TO ADDRESS THAT.

25 OKAY. SO NOW THAT I'VE GIVEN YOU A LITTLE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BIT OF HISTORY ABOUT THE PROGRAM, I'D LIKE TO BEGIN  
2 TO DISCUSS THE CONCEPT FOR THE RENEWAL OF THIS  
3 PROGRAM. I'M JUST GOING TO GO OVER THE OBJECTIVES  
4 AGAIN, WHICH ARE TO INSPIRE, EDUCATE, AND MOTIVATE  
5 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TO BECOME INVOLVED IN CIRM'S  
6 MISSION OF ACCELERATING STEM CELL TREATMENTS TO  
7 PATIENTS WITH UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS, TO PROVIDE SUMMER  
8 TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES, AND TO BROADEN THE  
9 PARTICIPATION IN STEM CELL GENE THERAPY AND RELATED  
10 RESEARCH TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO REPRESENT THE  
11 DIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S POPULATION AND WHO MIGHT  
12 NOT OTHERWISE HAVE OPPORTUNITIES TO TAKE PART IN  
13 SUMMER RESEARCH INTERNSHIPS DUE TO SOCIOECONOMIC  
14 CONSTRAINTS, AND, FINALLY, TO FOSTER A COMMITMENT  
15 AMONG TRAINEES TO THE GOAL OF ACCELERATING THE  
16 DELIVERY OF STEM CELL-BASED AND GENE THERAPY TO  
17 PATIENTS WITH UNMET NEEDS.

18 SO, AGAIN, THE SPARK TRAINING PROGRAM  
19 STRUCTURE AS I DESCRIBED BEFORE IS THAT A QUALIFIED  
20 PROGRAM DIRECTOR BASED AT THE AWARDEE INSTITUTION  
21 WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION  
22 OF ALL ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED BY THE PROGRAM AS WELL  
23 AS THE RECRUITMENT OF DIVERSE AND QUALIFIED  
24 STUDENTS. THEY WILL INVOLVE HANDS-ON MENTORED  
25 SUMMER RESEARCH AT HOST LABORATORIES AT THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 AWARDDEE'S INSTITUTION WHICH ARE NONPROFIT RESEARCH  
2 UNIVERSITIES OR RESEARCH INSTITUTES OR COMPANIES.  
3 THEY WILL INCLUDE PREPARATORY COURSES AND WORKSHOPS  
4 TO PREPARE THE STUDENTS FOR THEIR INTERNSHIPS, WHICH  
5 WILL BE APPROXIMATELY EIGHT WEEKS OVER THE SUMMER.  
6 THEY WILL CONTINUE TO PROPOSE ACTIVITIES TO ENGAGE  
7 STUDENTS WITH PATIENTS AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND  
8 WILL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE ANNUAL SPARK POSTER DAY  
9 SO THAT THE STUDENTS CAN COME TOGETHER AND NETWORK  
10 AND CELEBRATE THEIR ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH THEMSELVES  
11 AND THEIR FAMILIES.

12 NOW, WHILE WE ARE MAINTAINING THAT  
13 ESTABLISHED PLATFORM BECAUSE WE BELIEVE IT'S  
14 SUCCESSFUL, WE ARE PROPOSING SEVERAL UPDATES,  
15 IMPROVEMENTS ALONG THE LINES OF WHAT WE'VE BEEN  
16 DISCUSSING AND ALSO SOME ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO BRING  
17 IT INTO BETTER ALIGNMENT WITH PROPOSITION 14.

18 FIRST, WE ARE PROPOSING TO EXPAND THE  
19 ALLOWABLE SCOPE OF RESEARCH PROJECTS BEYOND STEM  
20 CELL SCIENCE TO ALSO INCLUDE GENE THERAPY AND  
21 RELATED REGENERATIVE MEDICINE RESEARCH IN ACCORDANCE  
22 WITH PROPOSITION 14. THIS IS EXACTLY THE SAME TYPE  
23 OF SCOPE CHANGE WE PROPOSED IN THE BRIDGES AND  
24 TRAINING GRANT AWARDS EARLIER THAT YOU APPROVED.  
25 AND THIS BRINGS THIS PROGRAM INTO ALIGNMENT WITH



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PROPOSITION 14.

2 WE'RE PROPOSING TO ALLOW THE INSTITUTIONS  
3 TO PARTNER WITH ANOTHER ORGANIZATION TO INCREASE THE  
4 AVAILABILITY AND DIVERSITY OF HOST LABORATORIES IN  
5 WHICH THE STUDENTS CAN WORK OVER THE SUMMER. AND  
6 CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE ARE DOING WITH ALL OF OUR  
7 PROGRAMS AND THE DISCUSSIONS THAT THE BOARD HAS BEEN  
8 ENGAGED IN OVER THE PAST FEW MONTHS, WE ARE  
9 PROVIDING MORE FORMAL REQUIREMENTS TO MAINTAIN AND  
10 STRENGTHEN THE FOCUS OF THESE PROGRAMS ON DIVERSITY,  
11 EQUITY, AND INCLUSION.

12 WE'RE GOING TO BE MORE FORMAL AND  
13 INSTRUCTIVE IN REQUIRING AN ALUMNI TRACKING PLAN TO  
14 ENABLE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING ON SOME OF  
15 THE THINGS YOU ASKED ABOUT AND MORE, DEPENDING ON  
16 HOW THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS AND STRATEGIC PLANNING GO,  
17 INCLUDING COLLEGE ACCEPTANCE, CHOICE OF MAJOR, AND  
18 ANY POSITIONS TAKEN BY ALUMNI OF THE PROGRAM AFTER  
19 HIGH SCHOOL OR AFTER COLLEGE, INCLUDING, AS DR.  
20 MARTIN SUGGESTED, FINDING OUT IF ANYONE IS DROPPING  
21 OUT AND PERHAPS THE REASONS WHY.

22 AND, FINALLY, WE ARE PROPOSING SOME SMALL  
23 CHANGES TO THE BUDGET STRUCTURE AS WELL AS AN  
24 INCREASE IN THE OVERALL AWARD AMOUNT TO BETTER  
25 REFLECT THE PRESENT ECONOMY AND TO AFFORD MORE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FLEXIBILITY FOR RECRUITING AND APPOINTING A DIVERSE  
2 COHORT THAT INCLUDES SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED  
3 STUDENTS. AND I'M GOING TO SPEND THE NEXT COUPLE OF  
4 SLIDES GOING OVER THOSE SPECIFIC CHANGES THAT I  
5 ADDRESSED IN THE LAST BULLET SO THAT YOU UNDERSTAND  
6 THE RATIONALE FOR THE ALLOCATION THAT WE WILL BE  
7 REQUESTING AT THE END OF MY TALK.

8 SO LET ME JUST WALK YOU THROUGH THE SLIDE.  
9 IT LOOKS LIKE THERE'S A LOT OF INFORMATION HERE, BUT  
10 BASICALLY THIS IS A CHART THAT SHOWS WHAT COSTS GO  
11 INTO AN INDIVIDUAL SPARK AWARD. EACH SPARK AWARD  
12 SUPPORTS UP TO TEN STUDENTS PER SUMMER, AND THE  
13 COSTS OF EACH AWARD ARE DIVIDED INTO THE CATEGORIES  
14 YOU SEE ALONGSIDE THE LEFT. SO BASICALLY THERE IS  
15 AN AMOUNT OF UP TO \$2500 THAT IS THE STIPEND THAT  
16 GOES DIRECTLY TO THE TRAINEE AS COMPENSATION FOR  
17 THEIR ESSENTIALLY FULL-TIME WORK IN THE LABS FOR  
18 EIGHT WEEKS OVER THE SUMMER. THERE'S A MENTOR  
19 STIPEND WHICH COMPENSATES THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE HOST  
20 LAB WHO IS WORKING DAY TO DAY WITH THE STUDENTS TO  
21 HELP THEM OUT. THERE'S A SMALL RESEARCH-RELATED  
22 FUND WHICH IS A SMALL SUPPLY BUDGET THAT GOES TO  
23 OFFSET THE COST OF THE LABORATORY THAT'S HOSTING THE  
24 INTERN. AND THEN THERE'S A TRAVEL ALLOWANCE OF \$750  
25 TO SUPPORT THE TRAINEE ATTENDING THE ANNUAL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CONFERENCE THAT I MENTIONED AND SHARING THEIR  
2 POSTER.

3 SO THE DIRECT COSTS AWARDED TO AN  
4 INDIVIDUAL TRAINEE IS APPROXIMATELY 4750. NOW, IN  
5 ADDITION TO THOSE TRAINEE COSTS, THERE IS A PROGRAM  
6 ADMINISTRATION PORTION OF THE BUDGET WHICH IS UP TO  
7 \$2500 PER STUDENT. THAT COVERS THE PERSONNEL AND  
8 THE COST OF ADMINISTERING THE PROGRAM. IT ALSO  
9 SUPPORTS THE PATIENT ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNITY  
10 OUTREACH ACTIVITIES THAT I SPOKE OF THAT THE  
11 STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN.

12 AND THEN THERE'S INDIRECT COST OF 10  
13 PERCENT. SO THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE AWARD PER  
14 TRAINEE, INCLUDING THE TRAINEE ASSOCIATED AND  
15 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, IS JUST UNDER \$8,000. NOW,  
16 YOU CAN SEE THAT THAT WAS THE BUDGET FOR BOTH 2011  
17 AND 2015. SO THERE HAVE NOT ACTUALLY BEEN ANY  
18 ADJUSTMENTS TO THESE AWARDS SINCE 2011.

19 FOR THE 2021 CONCEPT, WE ARE PROPOSING  
20 SOME INCREASES THAT WILL RAISE THE RATE  
21 APPROXIMATELY 22 PERCENT SO THAT THE TOTAL COST PER  
22 TRAINEE WILL BE \$10,175. AND THESE COSTS ARE MAINLY  
23 ATTRIBUTED TO BY AN INCREASE IN THE STIPEND AMOUNT  
24 THAT WILL GO DIRECTLY TO THE TRAINEE, RAISING IT  
25 FROM UP TO 2500 TO UP TO 4500. AND THIS IS TO BRING

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IT IN ALIGNMENT WITH MINIMUM WAGE.

2 AND THEN THE SECOND IS WE HAVE NOT REALLY  
3 TAKEN AWAY THE MENTOR STIPEND AND RESEARCH-RELATED  
4 FUNDS, BUT WE ARE MOVING THEM INTO THE PROGRAM  
5 ADMINISTRATION PORTION OF THE BUDGET, WHICH YOU CAN  
6 SEE DOWN BELOW HAS BEEN RAISED FROM 2500 TO 4,000.

7 AND ON MY NEXT SLIDE I'M GOING TO GO INTO  
8 THE RATIONALE FOR THESE CHANGES.

9 DR. LEVITT: KELLY, COULD I ASK A  
10 QUESTION?

11 DR. SHEPARD: OF COURSE.

12 DR. LEVITT: THE INDIRECT COSTS, IT'S NOT  
13 A LOT OF MONEY, BUT JUST AS -- NIH INDIRECT COST ON  
14 TRAINING PROGRAMS IS 8 PERCENT. THAT'S SUPPOSED TO  
15 COVER ALL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, RIGHT? THAT'S WHAT  
16 INDIRECT COSTS ARE FOR. SO I'M A LITTLE CONFUSED  
17 ABOUT THE \$4,000 PLUS 10 PERCENT ON INDIRECT COSTS.  
18 I'M THINKING ABOUT WHAT THE NIH DOES FOR THEIR  
19 TRAINING PROGRAMS.

20 DR. SHEPARD: ALL OF OUR TRAINING PROGRAMS  
21 SINCE I'VE BEEN AT CIRM HAVE BEEN 10 PERCENT. AND I  
22 DON'T KNOW IF SOMEONE FROM GRANTS MANAGEMENT WANTS  
23 TO EXPLAIN WHAT MIGHT BE DIFFERENT ABOUT HOW WE  
24 CALCULATE THAT COMPARED TO NIH. BUT THE PROGRAM  
25 ADMINISTRATION IS MAINLY, IN MY EXPERIENCE, COVERING

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE SALARY SUPPORT FOR THE PEOPLE WHO ARE  
2 ADMINISTERING THE PROGRAM, THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, ANY  
3 COORDINATORS OR MENTOR HELPERS WITH THAT, AND IT  
4 ALSO SUPPORTS THE PREPARATORY WORKSHOPS AND THINGS  
5 LIKE THAT THAT THEY'RE HOLDING FOR THE STUDENTS, AS  
6 WELL AS THE PATIENT ENGAGEMENT AND THE COMMUNITY  
7 OUTREACH ACTIVITIES.

8 DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION?

9 DR. LEVITT: IT ANSWERS THE QUESTION, BUT  
10 IT'S STILL CONFUSING TO ME ABOUT HOW THOSE  
11 DOLLARS -- WHY THEY'RE BEING ALLOCATED THE WAY  
12 THEY'RE BEING ALLOCATED. BUT I'M JUST THINKING -- I  
13 THINK THE INCREASE IN STIPEND IS GREAT. I'M JUST  
14 THINKING ABOUT THE NUMBERS OF STUDENTS -- WHAT'S THE  
15 ESTIMATED NUMBER OF STUDENTS THAT WE SUPPORTED IN  
16 ANY PARTICULAR SUMMER GIVEN THIS BUDGET?

17 DR. SHEPARD: EACH OF THESE AWARDS CAN  
18 SUPPORT UP TO TEN STUDENTS PER SUMMER.

19 DR. LEVITT: TEN STUDENTS PER SUMMER. ALL  
20 RIGHT. THANKS.

21 DR. VUORI: CAN I MAKE A QUICK COMMENT?

22 DR. SHEPARD: SURE.

23 DR. VUORI: I BELIEVE HIGH SCHOOL  
24 INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE INDIRECT  
25 CALCULATION FOR FEDERAL AWARDS. AND THEN I THINK IT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DOES MAKE SENSE TO SEPARATELY FUND THE  
2 ADMINISTRATION IF THAT'S THE STANDARD BY THE  
3 RECIPIENT ORGANIZATIONS AS WELL.

4 DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU. ARE THERE ANY  
5 OTHER QUESTIONS? OKAY. ALL RIGHT.

6 SO I WOULD JUST LIKE TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE  
7 BIT OF RATIONALE FOR WHY WE'RE PROPOSING TO INCREASE  
8 THOSE TWO CATEGORIES TO THE EXTENT THAT WE DID. SO  
9 FIRST OF ALL, RAISING THE STIPEND CAP FROM 2500 TO  
10 4500 BRINGS IT INTO CLOSER ALIGNMENT WITH MINIMUM  
11 WAGE. AND WE STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT THIS WILL  
12 INCREASE THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S ABILITY TO RECRUIT  
13 AND MAINTAIN STUDENTS FROM A DIVERSE AND  
14 SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUND. FOR ONE  
15 REASON, THIS MAKES THE PAY COMPARABLE TO AN  
16 ALTERNATIVE SUMMER JOB SO SOMEONE DOESN'T HAVE TO  
17 CHOOSE BETWEEN TAKING A JOB TO HELP SUPPORT  
18 THEMSELVES VERSUS WORKING IN THE LAB OVER THE  
19 SUMMER. AND IT HAS BEEN THE EXPERIENCE FROM MY  
20 SPEAKING TO THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS OF THESE PROGRAMS,  
21 NOT ONLY FROM THIS PROGRAM, BUT ALSO FROM THE  
22 BRIDGES PROGRAM, AND ALSO RECENT STUDIES ARE  
23 SUGGESTING THAT THE ADEQUATE PAY IS ABSOLUTELY  
24 CRITICAL FOR REDUCING BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION FOR  
25 UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES. SO WE BELIEVE THAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OFFERING THE ABILITY TO OFFER A HIGHER STIPEND IS  
2 GOING TO EVEN HELP THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS RECRUIT AND  
3 MAINTAIN STUDENTS FROM A MORE DIVERSE AND  
4 SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED BACKGROUND.

5 IN ADDITION, WE HAVE LEARNED FROM OUR  
6 EXPERIENCE IN MANAGING THESE PROGRAMS THAT THE  
7 MENTOR STIPENDS AND RESEARCH FUNDS ARE NOT ALWAYS  
8 HELPFUL OR EVEN NECESSARY TO FUNDING THESE PROGRAMS.  
9 SO RATHER THAN A PROGRAM BEING FORCED TO PAY A  
10 MENTOR WHO PERHAPS DOESN'T WANT THE MONEY OR  
11 ADMINISTER A SMALL \$500 RESEARCH FUND TO A LAB THAT  
12 PERHAPS DOESN'T FEEL THAT THEY NEED THAT, WE  
13 REDIRECTED THOSE FUNDS TO THE PROGRAM  
14 ADMINISTRATION, WHICH WILL ALLOW THE PROGRAM  
15 DIRECTORS TO HAVE MORE FLEXIBILITY IN HOW THEY APPLY  
16 THOSE FUNDS. THEY CAN STILL USE THEM TO SUPPORT A  
17 MENTOR OR A RESEARCH-RELATED FUND FOR A STUDENT IF  
18 THEY FEEL THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL OR NECESSARY. BUT  
19 THEY CAN HAVE A LITTLE MORE FLEXIBILITY IN HOW THEY  
20 USE THESE FUNDS TOWARDS ACHIEVING A STRONGER PROGRAM  
21 OVERALL.

22 IN SUM, THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED  
23 BUDGET FOR THE 2021 CONCEPT. WE WOULD BE ASKING FOR  
24 AN ALLOCATION TO SUPPORT TEN NEW AWARDS, WHICH WOULD  
25 BE A \$5.1 MILLION ALLOCATION. EACH OF THESE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 INDIVIDUAL TEN AWARDS WOULD BE A MAXIMUM OF  
2 \$509,000. AND SUPPORTING TEN TRAINEES EACH, THAT  
3 WOULD MEAN 500 NEW STUDENTS COULD COME THROUGH THIS  
4 PROGRAM. THESE WOULD BE FIVE-YEAR -- IT WOULD BE A  
5 FIVE-YEAR GRANT, SO FIVE SUMMERS. THE DIRECT  
6 STUDENT COSTS, WHICH INCLUDES THE STIPEND AND TRAVEL  
7 TO THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE, IS 5250, AND THE PROGRAM  
8 ADMINISTRATION AND OVERHEAD COSTS WOULD COME TO 4925  
9 PER STUDENT, WHICH BRINGS THE TOTAL COST PER STUDENT  
10 PER YEAR TO 10,175. AND, AGAIN, THIS IS A  
11 22-PERCENT INCREASE IN THE AWARD AMOUNT SINCE 2015  
12 WHEN THE SPARK AWARDS WERE ISSUED. HOWEVER, AS I  
13 SHOWED YOU, IT'S REALLY A 22-PERCENT INCREASE SINCE  
14 2011 WHEN THE PROGRAM WAS INITIALLY LAUNCHED AS THE  
15 CREATIVITY AWARDS.

16 AND, FINALLY, THE REQUESTED ACTION, THEN,  
17 IS FOR THE BOARD TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED SPARK  
18 TRAINING PROGRAM CONCEPT WITH AN ALLOCATION OF 5.1  
19 MILLION TO SUPPORT TEN NEW SPARK AWARDS, EACH FOR A  
20 FIVE-YEAR DURATION, WHICH WILL LEAD TO 500 NEW  
21 TRAINEES HAVING THE OPPORTUNITY TO WORK OVER THE  
22 SUMMER AT A MAXIMUM OF \$509,000 PER AWARD. AND THAT  
23 CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY  
24 OTHER QUESTIONS THAT I CAN FOR YOU.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 KELLY. I SHOULD NOTE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD  
2 THAT THIS WAS PRESENTED TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE  
3 AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY TO BRING TO THE BOARD FOR  
4 CONSIDERATION. DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?

5 MR. TORRES: I SO MOVE.

6 DR. HIGGINS: SECOND.

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART AND DAVID. THANK  
8 YOU.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ARE THERE QUESTIONS OR  
10 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

11 MR. TORRES: YES. I WANT TO MAKE A VERY  
12 QUICK COMMENT. THAT IS THAT WHEN I HELPED ESTABLISH  
13 THIS PROGRAM BACK IN 2011 -- KELLY, THANK YOU SO  
14 MUCH FOR YOUR EXCELLENT PRESENTATION AND TAKING INTO  
15 CONSIDERATION SOME OF THE BOARD'S QUESTIONS THAT  
16 OCCURRED IN THE PAST. AND LET'S KEEP IN MIND THAT  
17 SOME OF THESE STUDENTS WHO GO THROUGH THIS PROGRAM,  
18 WHETHER A SOPHOMORE OR A JUNIOR, SO THEY MAY NOT GO  
19 TO COLLEGE FOR ANOTHER YEAR. SO WE HAVE TO BE  
20 CAREFUL ABOUT HOW WE TRACK THAT.

21 SECONDLY, THIS PROGRAM AND THE BRIDGES  
22 PROGRAM ARE SOME OF THE FAVORITES OF THE LEGISLATURE  
23 BECAUSE THEY SEE THE IMPACT THAT IT HAS, NOT ONLY IN  
24 INNER CITIES, ESPECIALLY, FOR EXAMPLE, IN MY HOME  
25 TOWN OF LOS ANGELES, WHERE WE HAVE A FRANCISCO BRAVO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MEDICAL MAGNET SCHOOL WHICH REALLY DRAWS THE KIDS  
2 FROM EAST L.A. AND OTHER PARTS OF THE INNER CITY TO  
3 PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROGRAM. BUT ALSO IT GIVES A  
4 SENSE OF HOPE.

5 AND I THINK J.T. SAID IT VERY WELL. WHEN  
6 WE GO TO THESE POSTER MEETINGS AT THE END OF EACH  
7 SESSION, YOU'RE JUST OVERWHELMED AND SO INSPIRED BY  
8 THESE YOUNG PEOPLE. AND TO KNOW THAT WE ARE  
9 CONTRIBUTING IN A SMALL WAY TO CREATE A FUTURE FOR  
10 STEM CELL SCIENTISTS IN OUR STATE IS JUST VERY, VERY  
11 AWE INSPIRING. I WANT TO SAY I STRONGLY STAND  
12 BEHIND MY MOTION TO APPROVE THIS REPORT.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,  
14 ART. WELL SAID.

15 OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS  
16 OF THE BOARD? ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF  
17 THE PUBLIC?

18 HEARING NONE, I TOO WOULD LIKE TO, KELLY,  
19 THANK YOU FOR NOT ONLY YOUR PRESENTATION, BUT YOUR  
20 EXPERT STEWARDSHIP OF THIS OUTSTANDING PROGRAM.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., THERE IS ONE MEMBER  
22 OF THE PUBLIC. SO WHEN YOU'RE DONE, YOU CAN JUST GO  
23 THERE.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JUST TO SAY, AS ART DID,  
25 HOW THIS IS A REAL GEM IN OUR OVERALL PROGRAM THAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IS TRULY GOING TO SET UP. YOU SEE THESE KIDS GOING  
2 ON TO MAJOR IN THE SCIENCES AND WILL BE, WITHOUT  
3 QUESTION, SOMETHING THAT HELPS FILL THE PIPELINE AS  
4 THE FIELD CONTINUES TO MATURE. SO, YES, COMMENTS  
5 FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: IT'S FROM PHONE NUMBER  
7 650-255-2860. THERE'S A HAND RAISED. YOU CAN SPEAK  
8 IF YOU'D LIKE.

9 DR. PROUDFIT: GOOD AFTERNOON, MEMBERS OF  
10 THE BOARD. MY NAME IS DR. JOLIE PROUDFIT. I AM A  
11 DESCENDANT OF THE PECHANGA BAND OF LUISENO INDIANS,  
12 AND I AM THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR OF AMERICAN INDIAN  
13 STUDIES AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS  
14 AND THE DIRECTOR OF THE CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURE  
15 AND SOVEREIGNTY CENTER.

16 I THINK THIS WORK IS AMAZING, AND I  
17 APPLAUD EVERYONE INVOLVED AND ENGAGED IN THIS  
18 EFFORT. AND I REALLY WANT TO UNDERSCORE HOW  
19 IMPORTANT IT IS TO NOT EXCLUDE OUR AMERICAN INDIAN  
20 STUDENTS FROM PARTICIPATING. I KNOW THERE'S NO  
21 INTENTION OF THAT, BUT WE HAVE A VERY DIVERSE  
22 STUDENT POPULATION, VERY HARD TO REACH STUDENT  
23 POPULATION. WE HAVE OVER 110 FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED  
24 TRIBES IN CALIFORNIA WITH ABOUT 80 TRIBES SEEKING  
25 RECOGNITION, AND THE TWO LARGEST URBAN INDIAN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 POPULATIONS. SO IT TAKES SOME STRONG INTENTIONALITY  
2 AND PARTNERSHIP TO BE SURE THAT OUR AMERICAN INDIAN  
3 STUDENTS, WHO ARE THE FIRST CITIZENS OF THE STATE,  
4 TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WONDERFUL OPPORTUNITIES.

5 I RUN THE ONLY CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURE  
6 AND SOVEREIGNTY CENTER AT CAL STATE SAN MARCOS,  
7 WHICH SUPPORTS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND OUR  
8 STUDENTS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH THAT ENGAGES AND  
9 SUPPORTS TRIBAL CULTURE AND SOVEREIGNTY. WE HAVE  
10 THE LARGEST AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENT POPULATION PER  
11 CAPITA, AND WE, AGAIN, HAVE THE LARGEST NUMBER OF  
12 RESERVATIONS IN OUR COUNTY.

13 SO WHILE I KNOW WE DO A HAVE A BRIDGES  
14 PROGRAM IN OUR BIOLOGY PROGRAM, THERE REALLY IS NO  
15 INTENTIONALITY OF SUPPORTING OUR AMERICAN INDIAN  
16 STUDENTS TO BE ENGAGED IN THIS PROCESS. SO I WOULD  
17 LIKE TO ENCOURAGE AN EFFORT AND SOME INTENTIONALITY  
18 IN THAT EFFORT. AND ALSO, AS THIS GROUP LOOKS TO  
19 MAKE A STRONGER COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND  
20 INCLUSION, THAT THE BOARD ALSO CONSIDER ADDING AN  
21 AMERICAN INDIAN RESEARCH SCIENTIST SUCH AS SOMEONE  
22 LIKE A DR. ARAMA SIVA (PHONETIC), WHOSE BACKGROUND  
23 IN BIOTECH AND WHO'S A MEMBER OF LOS COYOTES TRIBE,  
24 WOULD BE A WONDERFUL ADDITION TO OUR GROUP AND  
25 ORGANIZATION TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE INCLUSIVE OF

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ALL OF OUR STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS EFFORT.  
2 AND, AGAIN, IF YOU NEED HELP WITH THAT, THE  
3 CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURE AND SOVEREIGNTY CENTER AND  
4 OUR DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN INDIAN STUDIES STANDS  
5 READY TO ASSIST YOU IN THAT ENDEAVOR. THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU FOR THAT VERY  
7 IMPORTANT PUBLIC COMMENT. WE REALLY APPRECIATE THAT  
8 PERSPECTIVE AND VERY MUCH ARE LOOKING TO BE AS  
9 OVERALL INCLUSIVE AS WE POSSIBLY CAN. SO THANK YOU.

10 ANY OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE  
11 PUBLIC?

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE NOT.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. HEARING NONE,  
14 MARIA, CAN YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. DAN  
16 BERNAL.

17 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

19 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

21 DR. BOXER: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.

23 DR. BRASHEAR: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE  
25 DULIEGE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. DULIEGE: YES.  
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.  
3 MS. DURON: YES.  
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.  
5 DR. FINE: YES.  
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.  
7 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.  
9 DR. FLOWERS: YES.  
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.  
11 DR. GASSON: YES.  
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.  
13 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.  
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
15 DR. HIGGINS: YES.  
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
17 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.  
19 DR. LEVITT: YES.  
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.  
21 DR. MALKAS: YES.  
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
23 DR. MARTIN: YES.  
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
25 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
2 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.  
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE  
4 PANETTA. AL ROWLETT.  
5 MR. ROWLETT: YES.  
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.  
7 DR. SELICK: YES.  
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.  
9 DR. STAMOS: YES.  
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.  
11 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.  
13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.  
15 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.  
17 DR. VUORI: YES.  
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.  
19 DR. WATSON: YES.  
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.  
21 THANK YOU. THE MOTION CARRIES.  
22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY  
23 MUCH. ON TO THE NEXT ITEM, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION  
24 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR EXISTING ALPHA STEM  
25 CELL CLINIC AWARDEES. I BELIEVE, JEN, YOU ARE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PRESENTING ON THIS ITEM.

2 MS. LEWIS: YES, J.T. GIVE ME ONE MOMENT  
3 TO SHARE MY SCREEN. CAN EVERYONE SEE THAT?

4 MS. DURON: YES.

5 MS. LEWIS: OKAY. GREAT. GOOD AFTERNOON,  
6 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND PUBLIC. I WILL BE BRINGING  
7 TO YOU TODAY A PROPOSAL FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR  
8 THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS NETWORK.

9 SO AS YOU RECALL IN JANUARY OF THIS YEAR,  
10 THE CIRM TEAM PRESENTED AN UPDATE ON THE ALPHA STEM  
11 CELL CLINIC PROGRAM, WHICH IS A \$40 MILLION  
12 INVESTMENT IN PERSONNEL TRAINING AND  
13 PATIENT-CENTERED CARE WHICH HAS SUCCESSFULLY  
14 ACCELERATED CELL AND GENE THERAPY CLINICAL TRIALS IN  
15 THE STATE.

16 THERE ARE OVER 105 TRIALS SUPPORTED SINCE  
17 2015, AND THAT'S ACTUALLY AN OLD STATISTIC. I THINK  
18 THAT'S FROM JANUARY. I THINK NOW IT'S 164, WITH 82  
19 FROM INDUSTRY SPONSORS AND 23 FROM CIRM-FUNDED  
20 INDUSTRY AND ACADEMIC SPONSORS AND OVER 57 MILLION  
21 IN INDUSTRY CONTRACTS.

22 THE FIRST THREE AWARDS ISSUED BY CIRM IN  
23 THIS PROGRAM WERE IN 2015 AT CITY OF HOPE, UC SAN  
24 DIEGO, AND UCLA/UC IRVINE. THEN IN 2017 WE ISSUED  
25 MORE AWARDS AT UCSF AND AT UC DAVIS.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1           TODAY WE ARE COMING TO YOU AS ALL FIVE OF  
2           THE EXISTING ALPHA CLINIC AWARDS IN THE PORTFOLIO  
3           HAVE ENDED OR APPROACHING THE END OF THEIR AWARD  
4           PERIOD. AND THERE IS A CALL IN PROPOSITION 14 FOR  
5           AN EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK, AND THIS  
6           NEW CONCEPT PROPOSAL WILL BE BROUGHT TO THE ICOC  
7           ALONG WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN ROLLOUT WITH A  
8           TARGETED PROGRAM LAUNCH IN MID-2022.

9           THUS, THE ALPHA CLINICS PROGRAM DIRECTORS  
10          HAVE REPORTED THAT BRIDGE FUNDING IS CRITICAL TO  
11          SUPPORT PERSONNEL AND CONTINUED OPERATIONS AS A  
12          NETWORK DURING THIS PERIOD AS THE AWARDS END AND  
13          FUNDING ENDS AND POSSIBLE NEW OPPORTUNITIES AS AN  
14          EXPANSION AWARD IN 2022.

15          SO THIS SLIDE SHOWS AN OVERVIEW OF THE  
16          FIVE AWARDS IN THE PORTFOLIO. WITH THE START AND  
17          END DATES, THE TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT APPROVED BY THE  
18          BOARD, THE AWARD STATUS, AND THE POTENTIAL GAP IN  
19          FUNDING. THE FIRST TWO AWARDS, AS YOU CAN SEE, AT  
20          CITY OF HOPE AND UCLA HAVE ENDED, AND THE FINAL  
21          THREE ARE ANTICIPATED TO END IN THE LATER HALF OF  
22          2021. I DID WANT TO NOTE THAT THE TWO AWARDS AT THE  
23          BOTTOM AT UC DAVIS AND UCSF WERE LAUNCHED IN 2017.  
24          AND THESE ARE A LITTLE UNIQUE AS THEY WERE ISSUED  
25          WITH OPERATIONAL MILESTONES, MEANING THAT THE END

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DATE OF THE AWARD IS ACTUALLY DETERMINED BY WHEN  
2 THAT MILESTONE IS ACHIEVED. AND IN THIS CASE,  
3 ALTHOUGH THE AWARDS WERE CONTRACTED IN NOVEMBER TO  
4 END IN NOVEMBER OF 2021, WE'VE RECEIVED UPDATED  
5 PROGRESS REPORTING FROM THESE TWO AWARDEES THAT THEY  
6 ARE ANTICIPATED TO ACTUALLY ACHIEVE THEIR MILESTONES  
7 EARLY IN MAY OF 2121. THUS, YOU WILL SEE THIS  
8 POTENTIAL GAP IN FUNDING COULD BE UP TO 12 MONTHS.

9 SO TODAY WE'RE COMING TO YOU WITH A  
10 PROPOSAL OF A ONE-YEAR SUPPLEMENT AWARD FROM JUNE  
11 2021 TO MAY OF 2022 WHEN WE ANTICIPATE A NEW RFA  
12 COULD BE LAUNCHED FOR EXPANSION OF THE NETWORK.  
13 THIS SUPPLEMENT WOULD SUPPORT TALENT RETENTION AND  
14 PROGRAM ACTIVITIES THAT ARE SPECIFIED IN THE  
15 ORIGINAL RFA. THESE ACTIVITIES INCLUDE COORDINATION  
16 OF CLINICAL RESEARCH AND MANUFACTURING TEAM,  
17 REGULATORY SUPPORT, PRODUCT PROCESSING, BIOSPECIMEN  
18 COLLECTION AND COORDINATION, MANAGEMENT OF PATIENT  
19 AND PUBLIC INQUIRIES, AND FEE-FOR-SERVICE  
20 CONTRACTING.

21 IN DETERMINING THIS PROPOSAL FOR FUNDING,  
22 WE LOOKED AT THE AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURES OF  
23 THESE AWARDS, WHICH INCLUDE BOTH DIRECT AND  
24 FACILITIES COSTS, WHICH IS \$1.36 MILLION. THUS,  
25 TODAY WE ARE PROPOSING A SUPPLEMENT AWARD OF

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 \$680,000 TOTAL COST WITH A ONE-TO-ONE AWARDEE  
2 MATCHING REQUIREMENT. AWARDEES WILL BE REQUIRED TO  
3 SUBMIT A JUSTIFICATION FOR FUNDING WITH A DETAILED  
4 BUDGET FOR THESE CRITICAL ACTIVITIES TO MAINTAIN  
5 THEIR KEY PERSONNEL AND OPERATIONS. AND AWARDEES  
6 WITH PROJECT PERIODS LESS THAN 12 MONTHS WILL BE  
7 REQUIRED TO REDUCE THEIR BUDGET PROPORTIONALLY BASED  
8 ON THEIR AVERAGE EXPENDITURE BURN RATE.

9 SO TODAY WE'RE PROPOSING A TOTAL  
10 ALLOCATION OF \$3.4 MILLION FOR FIVE SUPPLEMENT  
11 AWARDS. HERE IS A SUMMARY OF THIS PROPOSAL. THE  
12 AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURES, AGAIN, ARE 1.36  
13 MILLION. A TOTAL SUPPLEMENT AWARD PROPOSED TODAY IS  
14 680,000 WITH A MATCHING REQUIREMENT BY THE AWARDEE.  
15 THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE AWARDS FOR THIS SUPPLEMENT  
16 ARE FIVE WITH A TOTAL REQUEST TODAY OF 3.4 MILLION.

17 SO OUR ACTION TODAY IS REQUESTING THAT THE  
18 ICOC APPROVE OUR PROPOSAL TO ALLOCATE 3.4 MILLION TO  
19 A SUPPLEMENT FOR THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK. J.T.,  
20 I'LL STOP THERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JEN. AND  
22 BEFORE I OPEN IT UP TO QUESTIONS, I WOULD SIMILARLY  
23 LIKE TO REPORT THAT THIS ITEM WAS ROBUSTLY DISCUSSED  
24 AT THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND, AS PRESENTED HERE,  
25 ULTIMATELY RECOMMENDED FOR CONSIDERATION AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 APPROVAL BY THE BOARD.

2 DO WE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY  
3 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS ITEM? HEARING NONE, DO  
4 WE HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?

5 DR. BLUMENTHAL: MOVE TO APPROVE.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY GEORGE  
7 BLUMENTHAL. IS THERE A SECOND?

8 DR. DULIEGE: I SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY ANNE-MARIE  
10 DULIEGE. ANY COMMENTS ON THE MOTION BY MEMBERS OF  
11 THE BOARD? HOT MIC ASIDE, DO WE HAVE ANY COMMENTS  
12 FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?

13 SO BEFORE WE VOTE, JUST A COMMENT.  
14 OBVIOUSLY THIS IS ANOTHER ONE OF OUR HIGHLY  
15 SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS THAT WE ARE VERY PROUD OF. AND  
16 IT'S REALLY A NETWORK THAT WAS THE FIRST OF ITS KIND  
17 IN THE COUNTRY AND CONTINUES TO BE AND IS CONTINUING  
18 TO ENROLL MANY PATIENTS, BOTH FOR CIRM-FUNDED  
19 PROJECTS AS WELL AS NON-CIRM-FUNDED PROJECTS. I  
20 THINK, MARIA, WE ARE READY TO CALL THE ROLL.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. DAN BERNAL.

22 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

24 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. BOXER: YES.  
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.  
3 DR. DULIEGE: YES.  
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.  
5 MS. DURON: YES.  
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.  
7 DR. FINE: YES.  
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.  
9 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
11 DR. HIGGINS: YES.  
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
13 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.  
15 DR. LEVITT: YES.  
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
17 DR. MARTIN: YES.  
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
19 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.  
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE  
21 PANETTA. AL ROWLETT.  
22 MR. ROWLETT: YES.  
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.  
24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE MOTION CARRIES.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. JEN, THANK  
3 YOU FOR AN EXCELLENT PRESENTATION AND TO YOU AND ALL  
4 INVOLVED IN THIS OUTSTANDING PROGRAM. THANKS AGAIN.

5 WE NOW COME TO THE MOST IMPORTANT ITEM ON  
6 THE AGENDA, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF  
7 THE JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH, AND APRIL ICOC MEETING  
8 MINUTES. DO I HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?

9 DR. STAMOS: SO MOVED.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MICHAEL  
11 STAMOS. IS THERE A SECOND?

12 DR. LEVITT: YES.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY PAT LEVITT.  
14 THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I DOUBT HIGHLY THERE IS MUCH  
15 COMMENT, BUT DO WE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY  
16 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS ITEM? ANY COMMENTS  
17 FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? I THINK IF WE WERE ALL  
18 IN THE SAME ROOM WE COULD PROBABLY DO A VOICE VOTE  
19 ON THIS ONE; BUT SINCE WE AREN'T, I SUPPOSE, MARIA,  
20 WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: I WOULD LOVE TO.

22 HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. DAN BERNAL.

23 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

25 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.  
2 DR. BOXER: YES.  
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.  
4 DR. BRASHEAR: YES.  
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE  
6 DULIEGE.  
7 DR. DULIEGE: YES.  
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.  
9 MS. DURON: YES.  
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.  
11 DR. FINE: YES.  
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.  
13 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.  
15 DR. FLOWERS: YES.  
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.  
17 DR. GASSON: YES.  
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.  
19 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.  
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
21 DR. HIGGINS: YES.  
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
23 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.  
25 DR. LEVITT: YES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.  
2 DR. MALKAS: YES.  
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
4 DR. MARTIN: YES.  
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
6 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.  
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
8 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.  
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE  
10 PANETTA. AL ROWLETT.  
11 MR. ROWLETT: YES.  
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.  
13 DR. SELICK: I WILL ABSTAIN SINCE I WASN'T  
14 IN THOSE MEETINGS.  
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.  
16 DR. STAMOS: YES.  
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.  
18 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.  
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.  
22 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI. KAROL  
24 WATSON.  
25 DR. WATSON: YES.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.

2 MOTION CARRIES.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO  
4 THE NEXT ITEM, CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS  
5 SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THE TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH  
6 PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT. THIS IS THE  
7 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE PORTION OF THE  
8 MEETING. OS IS CONFLICTED HERE, SO I WILL DO MY  
9 BEST TO STEP INTO HIS LARGE SHOES AND RUN THIS ITEM.  
10 I BELIEVE FIRST --

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: I JUST WANTED TO LET --  
12 THERE ARE SOME BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAD CONFLICTS LATER  
13 THIS AFTERNOON JUST IN THEIR CALENDARS. IF YOU'RE  
14 NOT PART OF THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE, YOU  
15 DON'T HAVE TO STAY FOR THIS PORTION OF THE MEETING.  
16 THAT SAID, IF YOU'D LIKE TO, WE'D LOVE TO HAVE YOU.  
17 WHATEVER FITS INTO YOUR CALENDAR.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. BEGIN  
19 WITH THE PRESENTATION FROM GIL.

20 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR.  
21 CHAIRMAN. LET ME SHARE MY SCREEN TO SHOW THE  
22 PRESENTATION. IF YOU CAN'T SEE IT FOR ANY REASON,  
23 JUST LET ME KNOW.

24 SO I AM PRESENTING TO YOU THE  
25 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 RELATED TO OUR TRANSLATIONAL REVIEW. AND SO THIS IS  
2 THE FIRST UNDER PROP 14 OF THE TRANSLATION PROGRAM  
3 THAT WE HAVE HAD. WE HAVEN'T HAD IT IN A WHILE, BUT  
4 OUR INTENT IS, NOW THAT WE HAVE RELAUNCHED OUR  
5 RECURRING CORE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES, AND THE  
6 TRANSLATION PROGRAM IS A KEY PART OF IT, THAT WE  
7 WILL BE OFFERING IT ABOUT THREE TIMES PER YEAR GOING  
8 FORWARD.

9 THE TRANSLATION PROGRAM FITS RIGHT BETWEEN  
10 OUR DISCOVERY AND CLINICAL PROGRAMS IN THAT THEY  
11 TAKE APPLICATIONS AND PROJECTS THAT IDENTIFIED A  
12 SINGLE PRODUCT CANDIDATE AND TAKES THEM THROUGH  
13 TRANSLATIONAL ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE A PRE-IND  
14 MEETING IF THEY'RE A THERAPEUTIC OR OTHER  
15 PRESUBMISSION MEETING. AND I'LL EXPLAIN A LITTLE  
16 BIT MORE ABOUT THAT.

17 SO THE OVERALL OBJECTIVE HERE IS TO  
18 SUPPORT PROMISING STEM CELL-BASED PROJECTS THAT CAN  
19 ACCELERATE THE COMPLETION OF TRANSLATIONAL STAGE  
20 ACTIVITIES THAT ARE NECESSARY FOR ADVANCEMENT TO  
21 CLINICAL STUDY OR TO BROADEN END USE. AND SO THE  
22 TRAN PROGRAM OFFERS SUPPORT FOR UP TO FOUR DIFFERENT  
23 TYPES OF PRODUCTS. SO IT CAN BE A THERAPEUTIC, A  
24 DIAGNOSTIC, A DEVICE, OR A TOOL. FOR THERAPEUTICS  
25 WE ALLOW AWARD DURATION OF UP TO 30 MONTHS, FOR ALL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE OTHERS UP TO 24 MONTHS. OF COURSE, BECAUSE EACH  
2 OF THESE PRODUCT TYPES HAVE DIFFERENT REQUIREMENTS  
3 AND ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD GO INTO THESE PRODUCTS, WE  
4 ALSO HAVE DIFFERENT MAXIMUM AWARD AMOUNTS FOR EACH,  
5 WITH A THERAPEUTIC HAVING THE LARGEST ALLOCATION OF  
6 UP TO 4 MILLION IF IT'S A CELL OR BIOLOGIC OR UP TO  
7 TWO MILLION IF IT'S A SMALL MOLECULE.

8 THE CIRM TRANSLATIONAL PROGRAM ALSO, AS  
9 MENTIONED, TAKES PROJECTS THAT HAVE IDENTIFIED A  
10 SINGLE CANDIDATE IF IT'S A THERAPEUTIC WHERE THEY  
11 HAVE SHOWN DISEASE MODIFYING ACTIVITY AND, THUS,  
12 DEMONSTRATING THAT THEY'RE READY TO ENGAGE IN  
13 TRANSLATIONAL ACTIVITIES. FOR DEVICE, DIAGNOSTICS,  
14 A PROTOTYPE WITH A PROOF OF CONCEPT IS REQUIRED,  
15 SIMILARLY FOR ANY KIND OF TOOL. ONCE THEY ARE DONE  
16 WITH THE TRANSLATIONAL ACTIVITIES, THE EXPECTED  
17 OUTCOME FOLLOWING THESE AWARDS IS THAT THEY COMPLETE  
18 THEIR PRE-IND MEETING OR PRESUBMISSION MEETING IF  
19 IT'S A DIAGNOSTIC OR DEVICE. IF IT'S A TOOL, THAT  
20 THEY DO A DESIGN TRANSFER TO MANUFACTURING HERE  
21 BECAUSE THE EXPECTATION IS THAT THE TOOL IS  
22 SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE COMMERCIALIZED.

23 THIS IS ANOTHER VIEW OF LARGELY THE SAME  
24 THING, AGAIN, SHOWING THE TRAN PROGRAM SANDWICHED  
25 BETWEEN THE DISCOVERY AND CLIN1 FUNDING

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OPPORTUNITIES. SO FOR ANYBODY THAT IS DEVELOPING A  
2 PROJECT WITH CIRM AND TAKING IT THROUGH OUR FUNDING  
3 OPPORTUNITIES, SOMEBODY THAT HAS ACHIEVED THAT  
4 SINGLE CANDIDATE THROUGH THE DISC2 PROGRAM CAN COME  
5 INTO THE TRAN1. ONCE THEY LEAVE THE TRAN1, THEY CAN  
6 GO ON TO OUR CLINICAL OPPORTUNITY OF CLIN1 TO BEGIN  
7 THEIR IND-ENABLING DEVELOPMENT WORK. SO IT GIVES  
8 YOU A BETTER SENSE OF THE SPECIFIC TYPES OF  
9 ACTIVITIES THAT ARE CONDUCTED AND WHAT THE OUTCOMES  
10 ARE THAT ARE EXPECTED FOR THESE PROJECTS.

11 DURING THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW, WE  
12 PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO REVIEWERS. SO HERE'S JUST A  
13 SUMMARY OF SOME OF THE GUIDANCE THAT WAS PROVIDED IN  
14 TERMS OF HOW TO FOCUS THEIR REVIEW. I'LL MENTION  
15 WHAT THE REVIEW CRITERIA ARE, BUT JUST TO SAY AND  
16 THE REMINDER TO THEM, THAT THE REVIEW CRITERIA ARE  
17 THE SAME FOR ALL FOUR PRODUCT TYPES. SO WE ARE NOT  
18 DISTINGUISHING THEM IN TERMS OF HOW NECESSARILY WE  
19 REVIEW THEM OF THEIR OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE AND  
20 FEASIBILITY AND SO ON.

21 OUR GOAL IS TO IDENTIFY THE PROJECTS THAT  
22 ARE MOST LIKELY TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVE OF THE  
23 PROGRAM. THERE'S NO NEED TO RESERVE OR BALANCE  
24 AWARDS SLOTS FOR ANY OF THE PRODUCT TYPES. SO IF WE  
25 GET MORE OF ONE OR THE OTHER, IT IS REALLY MORE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ABOUT THE MERIT THAN IT IS TRYING TO BALANCE THE  
2 NUMBERS OF PRODUCTS.

3 ALSO A REMINDER TO ACCOUNT FOR DIFFERENCES  
4 IN PRODUCT TYPES WHEN EVALUATING THE ACTIVITIES AND  
5 PROPOSED OUTCOMES.

6 THE REVIEW CRITERIA THAT THE GWG REVIEWERS  
7 USED ARE SHOWN HERE. DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE  
8 NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT,  
9 MEANING WHAT VALUE DOES THE PROJECT OFFER, AND IS IT  
10 SOMETHING THAT IS WORTH DOING? DO THEY HAVE A SOUND  
11 RATIONALE? DO THEY HAVE A GOOD PLAN AND DESIGN TO  
12 CARRY IT OUT? IS IT FEASIBLE, MEANING DO THEY HAVE  
13 THE APPROPRIATE INFRASTRUCTURE, RESOURCES, AND TEAM  
14 TO CARRY IT OUT? AND THEN, LASTLY, DOES THE PROJECT  
15 ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THE UNDERSERVED?

16 I WILL NOTE THAT THAT LAST REVIEW  
17 CRITERION IS NEW, AND IT'S NEW TO THIS GROUP AS  
18 WELL, BUT IT'S ONE THAT WE HAVE PRESENTED TO THE  
19 BOARD PREVIOUSLY IN OUR EFFORTS TO INCREASE OUR  
20 ATTENTION TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION. SO  
21 THIS REVIEW CRITERION HAS A COUPLE OF SUBQUESTIONS  
22 IN IT THAT I THOUGHT WOULD BE WORTH SHOWING JUST SO  
23 YOU KNOW WHAT THEY'RE LOOKING FOR.

24 SO HERE IN THEIR ASSESSMENT IS DOES THE  
25 PROJECT PLAN AND DESIGN ADEQUATELY ADDRESS AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ACCOUNT FOR THE INFLUENCE OF RACE, ETHNICITY, SEX,  
2 AND GENDER DIVERSITY? AND WOULD THE PROJECT  
3 OUTCOMES INFORM THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PRODUCT OR A  
4 TOOL THAT SERVES THE UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS OF THE  
5 DIVERSE CALIFORNIA POPULATION INCLUDING UNDERSERVED  
6 RACIAL/ETHNIC COMMUNITIES?

7 ANOTHER ELEMENT THAT IS NEW AMONG THESE  
8 APPLICATIONS WAS THE ADDITION OF A DATA SHARING  
9 PLAN. SO WE ASKED APPLICANTS TO INCLUDE A PLAN OF  
10 HOW IT IS THAT THEY'RE GOING TO MAKE AVAILABLE THE  
11 DATA THAT'S GENERATED FROM THE PROJECT. AND SO  
12 INCLUDING THINGS LIKE WHAT TYPES OF DATA THEY WOULD  
13 PRODUCE, HOW THE DATA WILL BE MANAGED, WHAT DATA  
14 THEY WILL SHARE, AND IN WHAT WAYS; FOR EXAMPLE, THE  
15 KIND OF REPOSITORY THEY WOULD INCLUDE IT IN. AND IF  
16 THEY'RE NOT SHARING DATA, WHAT JUSTIFICATION THEY  
17 HAVE FOR NOT SHARING THAT DATA AND THE TIMELINE AND  
18 SO ON. SO THIS IS ANOTHER ELEMENT THAT THE GRANTS  
19 WORKING GROUP ASSESSED AS A FIRST TIME FOR THIS  
20 PROGRAM.

21 THE SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE TRAN  
22 APPLICATIONS IS BASED ON A SCALE OF ONE TO A  
23 HUNDRED. SO ANYTHING THAT SCORES BETWEEN 85 AND A  
24 HUNDRED MEANS IT'S RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, IF FUNDS  
25 ARE AVAILABLE. ANYTHING BELOW THAT IS NOT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. THESE ARE ALL BASED ON THE  
2 MEDIAN OF ALL INDIVIDUAL GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBER  
3 SCORES.

4 ANOTHER SOMEWHAT NEW ELEMENT IS THE  
5 INCLUSION OF THE MINORITY REPORTS. SO UNDER PROP  
6 14, ANY APPLICATION THAT IS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR  
7 FUNDING BASED ON THE SCORE BY THE GWG, BUT WHICH HAS  
8 35 PERCENT OR MORE OF THE MEMBERS SCORING TO FUND  
9 THE APPLICATION, MEANING THAT THEY SCORED IT AN 85  
10 OR MORE, MUST INCLUDE A MINORITY REPORT. AND SO A  
11 MINORITY REPORT IS INCLUDED IN THE REVIEW SUMMARY  
12 AND PROVIDES A SYNOPSIS OF THE OPINION OF REVIEWERS  
13 THAT SCORED THE APPLICATION 85 OR ABOVE TO THE  
14 EXTENT THAT WE COULD DECIPHER THAT OPINION FROM  
15 THOSE REVIEWERS.

16 JUST TO NOTE, THE SUMMARIES DON'T  
17 NECESSARILY CONTAIN ANY NEW INFORMATION THAT WE  
18 HAVEN'T PROVIDED BEFORE. WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY  
19 PROVIDED THE PERSPECTIVES OF ALL REVIEWERS NOTING  
20 THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROPOSAL AND  
21 ALSO PROVIDED ALL THE STATISTICS RELATED TO THE  
22 SCORE, THE SCORE RANGE, AND SO ON. WHAT WE'RE DOING  
23 DIFFERENTLY NOW UNDER PROP 14 IS BASICALLY TAKING  
24 THOSE COMMENTS AND PUTTING THEM IN THE FORM OF A  
25 SUMMARY AT THE END OF THE REPORT TO HIGHLIGHT THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FACT THAT 35 PERCENT OR MORE ACTUALLY SCORED IT 85  
2 OR ABOVE.

3 OKAY. SO THIS TABLE SUMMARIZE THE GRANTS  
4 WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS COHORT OF  
5 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE RECEIVED. THERE WERE 13  
6 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE REVIEWED. TWO OF THEM  
7 RECEIVED A RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING BASED ON THE  
8 MEDIAN SCORE. SO THE TOTAL APPLICANT REQUEST FOR  
9 THOSE TWO APPLICATIONS WOULD TOTAL ABOUT 8.6  
10 MILLION. WE HAVE AN ALLOCATION OF 60 MILLION IN  
11 TERMS OF AVAILABLE FUNDS FOR THE YEAR. SO WE ARE  
12 WELL WITHIN THOSE AMOUNTS.

13 AND SO I'M JUST GOING TO PROVIDE A BRIEF  
14 OVERVIEW OF THE TWO APPLICATIONS THAT ARE  
15 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE GWG. SO THE FIRST  
16 ONE IS APPLICATION TRAN1-12245. AND SO THIS ONE IS  
17 ENTITLED "DEVELOPMENT OF NOVEL SYNNOTCH CAR-T CELL  
18 THERAPY IN PATIENTS WITH RECURRENT EGFRVIII POSITIVE  
19 GLIOBLASTOMA."

20 AND SO THIS IS FOR PATIENTS WITH  
21 GLIOBLASTOMA THAT IS RECURRENT. AND THE APPROACH  
22 HERE AND THE CANDIDATE IS HUMAN T-CELLS THAT ARE  
23 TRANSDUCED WITH A LENTIVIRAL VECTOR THAT ENCODES AN  
24 ANTI-EGFRVIII SYNNOTCH THAT IS THEN PRIMED TO INDUCE  
25 AN ANTI-FA2IL13 RECEPTOR ALPHA II CHIMERIC ANTIGENS



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 RECEPTOR. AND SO THE IDEA IS THAT THIS CAR-T CELL  
2 THERAPY, WHICH IS A GENE THERAPY AS WELL, GOES TO  
3 THE SITE OF THE TUMOR, RECOGNIZES THE EGFR RECEPTOR  
4 IN ORDER TO PRIME IT, AND THEN THAT INDUCES THE  
5 OTHER TWO CARS WHICH CAN THEN LOCALLY ATTACK THOSE  
6 TUMOR CELLS THAT ARE EXPRESSING EITHER THE FA2 OR  
7 IL13 RECEPTOR ALPHA. SO IT'S AN INTERESTING  
8 STRATEGY THAT THESE APPLICANTS HAVE DEVELOPED.

9 AND SO THE TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED FOR THIS  
10 IS 2.66 MILLION FOR A TIME LINE OF ABOUT ONE AND A  
11 HALF YEARS FOR THAT AWARD.

12 AND THEN THE NEXT APPLICATION THAT IS  
13 RECOMMENDED IS TRAN1-12258. SO THE TITLE OF THIS  
14 ONE IS "CAR-TNM CELL THERAPY FOR MELANOMA TARGETING  
15 TYRP-1." AND SO THIS IS FOR AN UNRESPONSIVE OR  
16 MELANOMA THAT IS UNRESPONSIVE TO TRADITIONAL  
17 TREATMENTS OR WHERE THERE HAS BEEN A RELAPSE. IT IS  
18 AN AUTOLOGOUS THERAPY THAT USES NAIVE PROGENITOR  
19 T-CELLS THAT ARE GENETICALLY MODIFIED TO EXPRESS A  
20 CAR THAT TARGETS THE TYROSINE-RELATED PROTEIN 1 OR  
21 THE TYRP-1.

22 AND SO THE IDEA BEHIND THIS IS THAT THIS  
23 CAR IS INFUSED AND PATIENTS THAT HAVE MELANOMA CELLS  
24 THAT HAVE A HIGH EXPRESSION OF THIS TYRP-1 IN THEIR  
25 TUMOR CELLS WOULD BE CANDIDATES FOR RECEIVING THIS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THERAPY. AND THIS WOULD ALSO BE IN PATIENTS THAT  
2 HAVE ALREADY GONE THROUGH IMMUNE CHECKPOINT BLOCKADE  
3 AND HAVE NOT RESPONDED.

4 SO THAT IS A SUMMARY OF BOTH OF THOSE AND  
5 THAT ENDS THAT PRESENTATION. I WILL ALSO SHARE WITH  
6 YOU -- JUST GIVE ME A SECOND SO I CAN SHOW THE  
7 SPREADSHEET OF ALL THE APPLICATIONS SO YOU CAN SEE  
8 THAT AS WELL.

9 HERE'S IN GREEN THE TWO RECOMMENDED  
10 APPLICATIONS THAT ARE SHOWN, ALL THE ONES THAT ARE  
11 NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, AND THEN JUST  
12 HIGHLIGHTED IN RED ARE THE ONES THAT HAD THE  
13 ACCOMPANYING MINORITY REPORT.

14 SO WITH THAT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL PASS IT  
15 BACK TO YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY  
17 MUCH, GIL. TO REFRESH EVERYBODY'S MEMORY, THE  
18 SEQUENCE ON THIS IS FIRST WE ASK THE MEMBERS OF THE  
19 BOARD IF THEY WOULD LIKE TO ELEVATE ANY OF THE  
20 CURRENTLY NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING PROJECTS TO  
21 TIER I. SO DO I HEAR A MOTION TO ELEVATE ANY OF THE  
22 PROJECTS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, WHICH ARE  
23 THOSE UNDER THE GREEN LINE, TO ELEVATE THOSE TO TIER  
24 I FOR CONSIDERATION FOR FUNDING?

25 DR. MARTIN: I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE A

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 COMMENT. WHEN I SAW THIS, I LOOKED VERY CAREFULLY  
2 AT THE 12309 SINCE I KNOW A FAIR AMOUNT ABOUT THIS  
3 DISEASE, ETC. AND I WAS SURPRISED THAT IT WAS NOT  
4 HIGHER. BUT THEN I READ CAREFULLY THE CRITIQUES,  
5 AND I DECIDED THAT THE CRITIQUES WERE PROBABLY VALID  
6 AND IT NEEDED MORE WORK ESSENTIALLY. I THINK THAT  
7 WAS JUST SORT OF REASSURING TO ME. HERE'S SOMETHING  
8 THAT LOOKED VERY EXCITING, BUT THE ANALYSIS, I  
9 THOUGHT, WAS QUITE GOOD AND PROBABLY MOST  
10 APPROPRIATE.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR  
12 QUESTIONS? WE DON'T HAVE A MOTION HERE, BUT JUST  
13 ANYBODY LIKE TO COMMENT ON THIS?

14 MS. DURON: JONATHAN, NOT ON THAT, BUT I  
15 AM VERY INTERESTED IN US CONSIDERING TRAN1-12250,  
16 WHICH CAME IN AT AN 84, SO NOT TOO FAR OFF THE MARK.  
17 READ THE LETTERS THAT WERE SENT IN. I OBVIOUSLY,  
18 UNLIKE DAVID, CAN'T ARGUE OR QUESTION OR PUSH BACK  
19 ON THE SCIENCE AND THE MERIT OF THAT, BUT A COUPLE  
20 OF THE THINGS THAT I DID LIKE ABOUT THIS WERE THE  
21 IDEA THAT IT MET SOME NEEDS IN THE UNDERSERVED  
22 COMMUNITIES, PARTICULARLY IN THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN  
23 COMMUNITY THAT HAS A HIGHER BURDEN OF MULTIPLE  
24 MYELOMA. AND WHILE SOME PEOPLE MIGHT, IN THE  
25 VERNACULAR, CALL THIS A CRAPSHOOT, I AM ABOUT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1       SOMETIMES SCIENCE DOING THAT.

2                   I THINK THAT WHEN IT COMES TO THE  
3       UNDERSERVED AND RESEARCH, THERE ISN'T ENOUGH DONE.  
4       AND AS A RESULT, WHEN THE OPPORTUNITY COMES TO DO  
5       THAT, WHILE THE SCIENCE MIGHT BE JUST A SHADE OFF,  
6       OR SOMEONE DOESN'T QUITE SEE THAT IT'S READY TO COOK  
7       OR HOWEVER THEY REVIEW THIS, I LIKE THE IDEA THAT IF  
8       WE CAN PUSH UP SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO PERHAPS  
9       IMPACT THE LIVES, THE QUALITY OF THEIR LIVES, AND  
10      EVEN THE MORTALITY OF COMMUNITIES OF COLOR THAT HAVE  
11      BEEN UNDERRESEARCHED, THEN I LIKE TO TAKE A SHOT AT  
12      IT. SO I WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND THAT WE SINCERELY  
13      LOOK AT THAT 12250 AGAIN OR HOWEVER.

14                   CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO YSABEL MOVES  
15      TO MOVE THAT APPLICATION, WHICH IS 12250, UP TO TIER  
16      I FOR CONSIDERATION FOR FUNDING. DO WE HAVE A  
17      SECOND?

18                   MR. JUELSGAARD: I SECOND.

19                   CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY MR.  
20      JUELSGAARD. OKAY.

21                   JAMES, SO IN VOTING THROUGH THIS MOTION,  
22      WOULD THE BOARD, IF IT VOTED YES, WOULD THIS BE AN  
23      APPROVAL OF FUNDING, OR THIS AN APPROVAL OF MOVING  
24      THIS UP TO TIER I?

25                   MR. HARRISON: IT'S SOUNDED TO ME LIKE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MEMBER DURON WAS MOVING IT TO TIER I FOR  
2 CONSIDERATION ON AN INDIVIDUALIZED BASIS. IF I'M  
3 MISTAKEN ABOUT THAT AND SHE INTENDS TO MOVE TO  
4 APPROVE IT FOR FUNDING, THEN WE SHOULD CLARIFY THE  
5 MOTION AND MAKE SURE MR. JUELSGAARD IS IN AGREEMENT.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU, JAMES.  
7 YSABEL, WHICH OF THOSE TWO WERE YOU MOVING WITH  
8 RESPECT TO THIS PROJECT?

9 MS. DURON: THANKS FOR THE CLARIFICATION,  
10 JONATHAN. I ACTUALLY WOULD LIKE TO MOVE IT TO  
11 APPROVAL.

12 MR. JUELSGAARD: AGREE.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO IT'S BEEN MOVED AND  
14 SECONDED TO APPROVE THIS APPLICATION. ARE THERE  
15 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

16 DR. HIGGINS: I HAVE A QUESTION WHEN YOU  
17 HAVE TIME.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE.

19 DR. HIGGINS: I'D LIKE TO ASK STEVE IF HE  
20 COULD CHIME IN WITH A LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL OF WHY  
21 HE'S SUPPORTING OF THIS. MY CONCERN IS NOT THIS IS  
22 A BAD GRANT OR WAS A BAD PROPOSAL, BUT THAT THERE'S  
23 ONE THAT HAS EXACTLY THE SAME NUMBERS ASSOCIATED  
24 WITH IT THAT I SORT OF FEEL LIKE IF WE DO THIS ONE,  
25 THEN WE'VE GOT TO DO THAT ONE. SO I WOULD LIKE TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 HEAR FROM STEVE WHY HE'S ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT IT.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MR. JUELSGAARD.

3 MR. JUELSGAARD: CERTAINLY. SO OVER THE  
4 YEARS, WE HAVE HAD SITUATIONS WHERE THE SCORE HAS  
5 COME CLOSE TO THE SCORE OF 85, BUT DIDN'T QUITE MAKE  
6 IT. AND IN SOME CASES WE'VE REVISITED THE SCORES  
7 THAT ARE JUST UNDER 85 AND DECIDED THAT THE  
8 APPLICATION HAD ENOUGH MERIT WE SHOULD FUND IT  
9 ANYWAY. SO LET'S JUST START WITH THAT.

10 SO 85 IS NOT NECESSARILY A SACRED NUMBER.  
11 IT'S THE NUMBER THAT WE USE BASICALLY AS A CUTOFF  
12 POINT, BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT WE CAN'T CONSIDER  
13 APPLICATIONS THAT ARE LESS THAN THAT. SO THE REASON  
14 THAT I'M WILLING TO SUPPORT FUNDING THIS IS LARGELY  
15 BASED ON THE LETTER THAT WAS WRITTEN THAT DOUG  
16 GUILLEN SENT RELATING TO THIS PARTICULAR APPLICATION  
17 FROM LILI YANG AT UCLA. I THOUGHT SHE MADE A VERY  
18 COMPELLING CASE IN THAT LETTER FOR THE ICOC OR IN  
19 THIS CASE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE ACTUALLY  
20 TO CONSIDER FUNDING IT.

21 SO I WAS REALLY IMPRESSED BY THE  
22 THOROUGHNESS OF THAT LETTER AND THE POINTS THAT SHE  
23 MADE IN SUPPORT OF THE PROJECT.

24 DR. HIGGINS: THANK YOU, STEVE.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WE HAVE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 LARRY NEXT AND ANNE-MARIE AFTER LARRY.

2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I GUESS I WANT TO START BY  
3 ASKING THE QUESTION TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND  
4 SOMETHING CORRECTLY HERE WHERE IT SAYS IN THE  
5 SPREADSHEET NUMBER OF GWG VOTES, AND IT LOOKS AS  
6 THOUGH ONLY TWO MEMBERS VOTED TO APPROVE IT AND 13  
7 VOTED NOT. AND SO I'M A LITTLE WORRIED THAT WE'RE  
8 OVERRIDING WHAT IS A SOUND SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, BUT  
9 WHERE FOR SOME REASON THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT  
10 RESERVATIONS AT THE END OF THE DAY.

11 AND I'LL AGREE WITH WHAT DAVID HIGGINS  
12 SAID, WHICH IS WHEN YOU START PULLING GRANTS OUT  
13 WITH SIMILAR SCORES, YOU'VE GOT YOURSELF A VERY  
14 SLIPPERY SLOPE. ONE THING THAT WE ARE DOING THAT  
15 WOULD ORDINARILY NOT HAPPEN AT AN ORGANIZATION LIKE  
16 THE NIH, FOR EXAMPLE, IS WE DON'T SEEM TO HAVE A  
17 BUDGET FOR HOW MUCH WE'RE WILLING TO SPEND IN THIS  
18 ROUND BECAUSE ORDINARILY YOU'D USE YOUR BUDGET  
19 LIMITS TO DECIDE HOW FAR DOWN A PRIORITY LIST YOU  
20 WOULD GO, AND WE'RE KIND OF MISSING THAT. AND I'M A  
21 LITTLE WORRIED THAT SINCE WE HAVE \$5.5 BILLION IN  
22 THE BANK, WE'RE GOING TO BE A LITTLE TOO GENEROUS AT  
23 THE START, AND WE'RE GOING TO PAY FOR IT DOWN THE  
24 LINE. SO I'M UNCOMFORTABLE APPROVING THIS.

25 DR. DULIEGE: ACTUALLY IF I MAY SAY IF YOU

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DON'T MIND, I HAVE THE SAME -- I WAS PUZZLED IN THE  
2 SAME WAY THAT LARRY WAS PUZZLED BECAUSE A GRANT THAT  
3 IS AN AVERAGE AND A MEDIAN OF 84 AND WITH 13 NO,  
4 THAT'S JUST SIMPLY INCONSISTENT. YOU ONLY SEE THAT  
5 WAY BELOW ON THE LIST.

6 SO I WENT TO THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT AND  
7 ACTUALLY, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, IT'S DISCUSSED ON  
8 PAGE 11. AND I WONDER IF THERE'S NOT A TYPO HERE  
9 AND IT SHOULD BE REVERSED. AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE  
10 13, I SEE WHAT APPEARS TO BE A MISTAKE, 13 NO AND 2  
11 YES. BUT WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE NEXT PAGE, THE YESES  
12 ARE 12, 12, 11, 14, 13. AND THE NOS ARE 2, 2, 3, 0,  
13 1. SO I'M JUST WONDERING IF SOMEONE WOULD CLARIFY  
14 AND MAYBE THERE'S JUST PURELY A TYPO.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, IF YOU COULD  
16 COMMENT ON THAT AND ALSO ADDRESS LARRY'S COMMENT  
17 ABOUT WHAT THE BUDGET IS, WHICH I THINK YOU  
18 MENTIONED IN YOUR PRESENTATION, BUT TO REITERATE  
19 WHAT THE MOTION IS FOR TRAN PROJECTS THIS YEAR OR  
20 THIS CYCLE.

21 DR. SAMBRANO: HAPPY TO DO THAT. SO THE  
22 BUDGET FOR THIS CYCLE AND ACTUALLY FOR THE YEAR,  
23 WHICH INCLUDES JUST THE ONE CYCLE, IS 60 MILLION.  
24 SO WE ARE WELL WITHIN THAT AMOUNT. THERE'S NO --  
25 IT'S UNLIKELY THAT WE WOULD REACH THAT LIMIT. WE DO



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1       GENERALLY HAVE AN AMOUNT, BUT IT'S FOR THE YEAR  
2       RATHER THAN FOR THIS SPECIFIC CYCLE.

3               AS IT RELATES TO THE NUMBERS, THE NUMBERS  
4       ARE CORRECT BUT THEY JUST REFERENCE SOMETHING  
5       DIFFERENT. SO THE 2 VERSUS 13 REPRESENTS THE NUMBER  
6       OF GWG MEMBERS THAT SCORED AN APPLICATION AN 85 OR  
7       ABOVE. SO TWO MEMBERS DID THAT. THIRTEEN SCORED IT  
8       BELOW 85, MEANING THEY DIDN'T THINK IT SHOULD BE  
9       RECOMMENDED.

10              THE NUMBERS THAT ARE ALONG WITH THE  
11       COMMENTS OF THE YES OR NO REFER TO THE SPECIFIC  
12       REVIEW CRITERIA. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THE QUESTION THAT  
13       THEY'RE ANSWERING THERE IS DOES THE PROPOSAL HAVE  
14       THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT?  
15       TWELVE VERSUS TWO, THAT MEANS THAT 12 MEMBERS SAID,  
16       YES, THEY BELIEVE IT HAS NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND  
17       POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT AND TWO SAID NO. HOWEVER, WHEN  
18       IT COMES TO THE SCORE, EVEN THOUGH A REVIEWER MAY  
19       FEEL, YES, THIS HAS POTENTIAL, THIS IS ADDRESSING A  
20       SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM, THEY MAY STILL SCORE IT BELOW  
21       85 EITHER BECAUSE THEY BELIEVE IT NEEDS MORE WORK OR  
22       THEY COULD DO SOMETHING BETTER.

23              AND I JUST WANT TO SAY IN GENERAL I THINK  
24       THE APPLICATIONS, BOTH THE ONES THAT HAVE THE  
25       MINORITY REPORT AS WELL AS THIS ONE, I THINK FALL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 INTO THE CAMP THAT REVIEWERS DIDN'T SEE ANYTHING  
2 THAT WAS A FATAL FLAW OR ANYTHING SIGNIFICANT THAT  
3 THEY THOUGHT WAS WRONG WITH THESE APPLICATIONS FROM  
4 A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE, BUT THEY DID IDENTIFY  
5 SEVERAL THINGS IN THE APPLICATION THAT THEY THOUGHT  
6 THE APPLICANTS SHOULD ADDRESS, AND IT'S SOMETHING  
7 THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE AGAIN, I THINK, WITH THE  
8 EXPECTATION THAT THE APPLICANT WOULD RESUBMIT AND  
9 MAKE SOME OF THOSE CORRECTIONS.

10 WITH THAT, I SHOULD ALSO NOTE, BECAUSE I  
11 THINK I MAY NOT HAVE MENTIONED IT, IS THAT THE NEXT  
12 APPLICATION DEADLINE FOR THE TRAN PROGRAM IS IN  
13 AUGUST, AGAIN, WITH THE IDEA THAT WE WANT THIS TO BE  
14 A RECURRING OPPORTUNITY TO CONTINUE TO CAPTURE BOTH  
15 NEW PROJECTS AS WELL AS PROJECTS THAT MAY HAVE NOT  
16 MADE IT IN THE LAST CYCLE.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, IS IT THE FEELING  
18 OF YOU AND THE TEAM THAT THESE PROJECTS COULD BE  
19 IMPROVED AND WOULD BE IN BETTER CONDITION FROM A GWG  
20 PERSPECTIVE IF THEY CAME BACK IN AUGUST HAVING  
21 INCORPORATED IN THE SUGGESTIONS?

22 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THAT WOULD BE THE  
23 RECOMMENDATION FROM CIRM, THAT GIVEN THE  
24 AVAILABILITY OF THE DEADLINE COMING UP IN AUGUST,  
25 THAT THE APPLICANTS DO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IMPROVEMENTS THAT WOULD MAKE THE PROJECTS THAT MUCH  
2 BETTER AND KIND OF MAINTAIN A MERIT THRESHOLD FOR  
3 THEM IN TERMS OF GETTING THE BEST POSSIBLE PROJECTS  
4 COMING FORWARD.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER  
6 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

7 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU SO MUCH, GIL, FOR  
8 YOUR EXPLANATION. THAT HELPS A LOT. AT THE END  
9 WE'RE LEFT IN THIS UNCOMFORTABLE SITUATION, AT LEAST  
10 I AM, AND THAT'S WHY WE HAVE THIS RESPONSIBILITY.  
11 ON ONE HAND, WE REALLY ONLY WANT TO GO IN A  
12 DIRECTION THAT IS NOT THE ONE RECOMMENDED BY THE  
13 CIRM. ON THE OTHER HAND HERE, THERE IS A  
14 DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE GWG VOTES THAT IN GENERAL  
15 RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF THIS PROGRAM, BUT AT THE END,  
16 WHEN IT COMES TO VOTE, VOTE BELOW THE LINE IN SOME  
17 WAYS. I APPRECIATE YOUR EXPLANATION WHICH IS, WELL,  
18 LET'S RESUBMIT WITH A LITTLE BIT OF IMPROVEMENT; BUT  
19 THAT MAKES OUR DECISION MORE DIFFICULT, I GUESS,  
20 MAYBE MORE SUBTLE IN SOME WAYS. I JUST WANTED TO  
21 MAKE THAT COMMENT. I DON'T KNOW IF OTHERS FEEL IN  
22 THE SAME SITUATION I AM. I REALLY DISLIKE TO VOTE  
23 IN A DIRECTION THAT IS NOT THE ONE RECOMMENDED BY  
24 CIRM IN GENERAL.

25 MS. DURON: ANNE-MARIE, WHEN YOU SUGGEST

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 AGAINST WHAT CIRM HAS RECOMMENDED, ARE YOU REFERRING  
2 TO THE GRANTS GROUP THAT RECOMMEND IT?

3 DR. DULIEGE: ABSOLUTELY BECAUSE THE GWG,  
4 NOT ONLY THE RECOMMENDATION, BUT AS I UNDERSTAND IT,  
5 THESE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM ADVISORS HAVE BEEN  
6 REVIEWED BY THE CIRM EMPLOYEES AND EVALUATED AND  
7 THEN THAT'S THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION.

8 MS. DURON: THERE'S ALWAYS A LITTLE BIT OF  
9 REBEL IN ME. SO I APPRECIATE SCIENTIFIC INPUT, I  
10 APPRECIATE ALL OF THAT INTELLECT; BUT SOMETIMES,  
11 WHEN I SEE THAT THERE'S SOMETHING MISSING AND GAPS  
12 IN SERVICES, I TEND TO GO FOR THE HUMAN AS OPPOSED  
13 TO -- SORRY. I STILL THINK THERE'S A WORTHINESS  
14 HERE. HOWEVER IT WANTS TO BE PROPOSED BACK TO THE  
15 PEOPLE WHO TURNED IT IN, THEY WANT TO CLEAN IT UP, I  
16 DON'T KNOW. I JUST THINK THAT I APPRECIATE ALL OF  
17 THIS SCIENTIFIC INPUT AND STILL SOMETIMES LIKE TO  
18 VOTE AGAINST THAT.

19 WHEN I SAT ON THE BOARD OF THE CALIFORNIA  
20 BREAST CANCER RESEARCH PROGRAM, I DID THE SAME  
21 THING. WE WOULD GET THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, BUT  
22 SOMETIMES WHEN I SAW THAT THE COMMUNITY REALLY  
23 NEEDED TO HAVE A PROJECT LIKE THIS TO MOVE ITSELF  
24 FORWARD, TO LEARN MORE, TO GET MORE QUALITY OUT OF  
25 RESEARCH THAT DOESN'T SEEM TO BE COMING, I WOULD

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PUSH THINGS LIKE THIS. AND I WILL CONTINUE TO DO  
2 SO, BUT I REALLY APPRECIATE HOW YOU SEE THINGS. BUT  
3 THIS IS WHY PATIENT ADVOCATES SIT HERE, RIGHT?

4 DR. DULIEGE: ABSOLUTELY. THAT'S WHY  
5 THERE'S A VARIETY OF OPINIONS HERE. IN THIS CASE I  
6 THINK WE ARE TALKING MOST LIKELY EITHER VOTING NOW  
7 IN FAVOR OF THIS APPLICATION OR HAVING IT  
8 RESUBMITTED, SUBMITTED AGAIN IN AUGUST, AND MOST  
9 LIKELY, ALTHOUGH NO ONE CAN EVER MAKE A FORM OF  
10 PROMISE, MOST LIKELY IT WILL BE APPROVED THEN.

11 DR. ABDULHAAQ: MAY I ADD SOMETHING AS AN  
12 ONCOLOGIST? I DO SEE THE POINT THAT THIS IS AN AREA  
13 OF NEED; BUT AS AN ONCOLOGIST, I KNOW THIS IS A VERY  
14 COMPETITIVE FIELD, AND THERE ARE SEVERAL COMPANIES  
15 THAT ARE WORKING ON AUTOLOGOUS AS WELL AS ALLOGENEIC  
16 T-CELL THERAPIES FOR MULTIPLE MYELOMA. SO IF THE  
17 POINT IS THAT WE REALLY WANT TO GET THINGS TO THE  
18 PATIENTS WHO NEED THIS, WHICH I COMPLETELY RESPECT  
19 THAT POINT, THERE ARE DEFINITELY ALTERNATIVES BEING  
20 OFFERED.

21 I GUESS MY RESERVATION ABOUT APPROVING  
22 THIS WHEN THE GWG GROUP SAID THAT -- GAVE IT A SCORE  
23 OF 84 AND THEY DID NOT FEEL THAT IT'S READY TO BE  
24 ACCEPTED YET IS WE ARE NOT LOOKING AT THE FULL  
25 PROPOSAL AND PROTOCOL TO BE ABLE TO CRITIQUE IT AS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE GWG GROUP DID.

2 SO IT IS -- THE IDEA IS DEFINITELY WORTHY,  
3 BUT MAYBE IT JUST NEEDS A LITTLE BIT MORE WORK TO BE  
4 APPROVED. SO I GUESS I PERSONALLY, AS AN  
5 ONCOLOGIST, IF THAT'S WHAT THE GWG GROUP RECOMMENDED  
6 SINCE WE ARE NOT ABLE TO JUDGE THE PROTOCOL OR THE  
7 PROPOSAL OVERALL, THEN I WOULD SAY MAYBE WAIT ON IT  
8 AND FOLLOW THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO THANK YOU. I WOULD  
10 JUST WANT TO MAKE THE POINT THAT EVERYBODY,  
11 PARTICULARLY FOR THE NEW MEMBERS, THAT, AS STEVE  
12 MENTIONED, THERE HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS OCCASIONS OVER  
13 THE YEARS WHERE THE BOARD IN PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW,  
14 WHICH IS WHAT WE ARE DOING NOW, WHICH IS SET UP TO  
15 CONSIDER NOT ONLY THE GWG RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT OTHER  
16 POINTS THAT MAY BE VIEWED AS IMPORTANT, THAT THE  
17 BOARD HAS MOVED PROJECTS THAT WERE NOT RECOMMENDED  
18 FOR FUNDING UP TO THE TOP LEVEL WHETHER IT'S IN  
19 TRAN, CLIN, DISC, OR WHATEVER.

20 THOSE WHO HAVEN'T BEEN THROUGH THIS, JUST  
21 TO MAKE SURE YOU'RE AWARE OF THAT, AND THAT THE  
22 BOARD IS NOT REQUIRED IN ANY WAY TO TAKE ALL GWG  
23 RECOMMENDATIONS AS A COLLECTIVE GROUP IF IT BELIEVES  
24 THERE ARE OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS TO APPROVE  
25 SOMETHING.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN, POINT OF ORDER.  
2 THE LAST SPEAKER, IS THAT A SUBSTITUTE MOTION TO LET  
3 THE FOLKS KNOW TO COME BACK IN AUGUST WITH A  
4 RENEWED --

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART, I BELIEVE YOU SHOULD  
6 NOT BE COMMENTING.

7 MR. TORRES: OH, SORRY. GOT IT. A FEW OF  
8 THE PERKS OF BEING A REGENT.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?  
10 LARRY.

11 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'LL TAKE A GUESS AT WHAT  
12 ART'S COMMENT MIGHT HAVE BEEN, WHICH IS IF WE DON'T  
13 ELEVATE IT FOR FUNDING NOW AND BASICALLY ASK THEM TO  
14 REVISE SO THAT IT'S A STRONGER PROPOSAL, IT'S NOT  
15 THAT IT'S NEVER GOING TO BE FUNDED. IT'S JUST GOING  
16 TO BE DELAYED A FEW MONTHS. SO IT'S REALLY NOT THE  
17 END OF THE ROAD FOR THIS PROJECT.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS OR  
19 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? ARE THERE  
20 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?

21 MR. ROWLETT: J.T., MR. JUELSGAARD HAS A  
22 COMMENT.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OH, HE DID. YES, STEVE,  
24 SORRY.

25 MR. JUELSGAARD: JUST IN RESPONSE TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 LARRY'S LAST COMMENTS. IF WE REALLY BELIEVED THAT  
2 THIS IS GOING TO COME BACK AND BE APPROVED IN  
3 AUGUST, THEN IT ALMOST GOES WITHOUT SAYING WE SHOULD  
4 APPROVE IT NOW, RIGHT? SO IF WE FULLY EXPECT IT TO  
5 BE APPROVED IN AUGUST, THEN WHY ARE WE WAITING? SO  
6 WE PUT A FEW BELLS ON THE APPLICATION?

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LARRY.

8 MR. GOLDSTEIN: I GUESS I DISAGREE WITH  
9 YOU, MR. JUELSGAARD OR DR. JUELSGAARD. IT'S BEEN  
10 THROUGH SCIENTIFIC REVIEW. THE GROUP DID FIND A  
11 NUMBER OF WEAKNESSES. WE CAN'T JUDGE FROM WHERE WE  
12 SIT HOW DIFFICULT IT IS TO ADDRESS THOSE ISSUES SO  
13 THAT IT'S SCIENTIFICALLY SOUND. AND I GUESS I  
14 BELIEVE IN TAKING THAT PART PRETTY SERIOUSLY.

15 MR. JUELSGAARD: WELL, AS J.T. SAID, THIS  
16 IS PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. SO WE CONSIDER ISSUES JUST  
17 BEYOND SCIENCE IN THESE DISCUSSIONS.

18 BACK TO SOMETHING THAT ANNE-MARIE WAS  
19 NOTING. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE NO VOTES ON THE FIVE  
20 DIFFERENT CRITERIA, THE GREATEST NUMBER OF NO VOTES  
21 IS ON ONE WHICH IS IS THE PROPOSAL WELL-PLANNED AND  
22 DESIGNED? AND THE VOTE, ONLY THREE PEOPLE OUT OF  
23 THE 14 THAT VOTED ON THAT SAID NO. SO THE NO VOTES,  
24 WHEN YOU GO THROUGH THIS PIECE BY PIECE BY PIECE ARE  
25 DISPROPORTIONALLY MUCH LOWER THAN THE YES VOTES.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1                   SO WHAT IT'S TELLING ME IS THAT, GIVEN  
2                   WHAT WE'VE GOT HERE, BOTH THE MEDIAN BEING 84 AND  
3                   THE MEAN BEING 83, IS THAT THERE IS A LOT OF  
4                   SCIENTIFIC MERIT HERE. IT'S JUST THAT THERE ARE  
5                   SOME FINE POINTS THAT I GUESS THE GWG WOULD REALLY  
6                   LIKE TO SEE. FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, AS I SAID WHEN  
7                   I READ THE LETTER THAT CAME FROM UCLA AND LILI YANG,  
8                   I WAS IMPRESSED WITH THE THOUGHT THAT THEY HAD PUT  
9                   INTO ADDRESSING THIS ORGANIZATION IN A REQUEST FOR  
10                  FUNDING. SO...

11                 MS. BONNEVILLE: I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT  
12                 THE PI IS ON THE LINE AND HAS HER HAND RAISED FOR  
13                 PUBLIC COMMENT IF THAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE.

14                 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. I SAW THAT.  
15                 BEFORE WE GET TO THAT, I JUST WANT OTHER COMMENTS  
16                 FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. YES, YSABEL.

17                 MS. DURON: I DO WANT TO LET OTHERS  
18                 COMMENT IF THERE ARE, BUT TO STEVE'S POINT. YES, IT  
19                 WAS THE LETTER THAT HELPED INFORM ME TO A GREATER  
20                 DEGREE. BUT ONCE AGAIN, AS I SAID, I WAS SO VERY  
21                 MOVED BY THE WHOLE ISSUE OF ADDRESSING UNDERSERVED.  
22                 AND WHILE MAYBE OTHERS MAY NOT THINK THAT IS THE  
23                 MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA, OFTEN SOMETIMES FOR ME IT  
24                 IS.

25                 I APPRECIATE -- I JUST HAD A LONG MEETING

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WITH SOME RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS AROUND MULTIPLE  
2 MYELOMA AND ITS EFFORTS TO INCLUDE THE  
3 AFRICAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY AND TO SOME EXTENT THE  
4 LATINO COMMUNITY, JUST REMINDING ME VERY CLEARLY HOW  
5 THERE ARE STILL MANY STEPS TO GO TO REACH  
6 PARTICULARLY VULNERABLE POPULATIONS. AND WHEN YOU  
7 CAN SEE A STRONG REPORT THAT RECOGNIZES THAT NEED  
8 AND WANTS TO SERVE IT AND THE SCIENCE IS THERE  
9 BASICALLY, AS STEVE POINTED OUT, I FEEL VERY  
10 STRONGLY IN RECOMMENDING IT. THANK YOU, JONATHAN.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER  
12 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

13 MR. ROWLETT: I WANTED TO REASSURE OTHER  
14 PATIENT ADVOCATES THAT THE CONVERSATION REGARDING  
15 UNSERVED AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES IN THE LAST TWO  
16 REVIEWS HAVE BEEN QUITE RIGOROUS AND, IN FACT, HAVE  
17 REACHED, I THINK, A POINT WHERE WE ARE REALLY  
18 BEGINNING TO IMPACT WHY UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES ARE  
19 NOT PARTICIPATING IN SOME OF THE TRIALS AND GIVING  
20 FEEDBACK TO APPLICANTS THAT I THINK WILL MAKE A  
21 DIFFERENCE.

22 SECONDLY, MY EXPERIENCE AS A GWG MEMBER IS  
23 THAT WHEN THERE ARE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT ARE MADE  
24 AND AN APPLICATION COMES BACK FOR RE-REVIEW, IT IS  
25 NOT AUTOMATICALLY APPROVED. THERE ARE OFTENTIMES

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CRITERIA THAT IN THE RE-REVIEW, SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA  
2 THAT I'M NOT QUALIFIED TO COMPLETELY SPEAK TO, THAT  
3 DON'T SATISFY THE SECOND REVIEW OF THE APPLICATION  
4 AND IT'S NOT APPROVED. SO MY EXPERIENCE IS QUITE  
5 DIFFERENT THAN WHAT MAYBE IS BEING IMPLIED, THAT IF  
6 THIS WENT BACK, IT WOULD AUTOMATICALLY BE APPROVED.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL.

8 OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

9 OKAY. DR. YANG, YOU HAVE THE FLOOR.

10 DR. YANG: THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON, THE  
11 ICOC CHAIR AND THE MEMBERS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR  
12 GIVING (UNINTELLIGIBLE) CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION  
13 ABOUT OUR PROJECT ON BEHALF OF OUR RESEARCH TEAM. I  
14 REALLY APPRECIATE THAT. AND SO I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE  
15 THIS OPPORTUNITY TO POINT OUT A FEW THINGS.

16 THIS EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION ABOUT THE GWG  
17 AND THE SCORE SYSTEM AND THE OVERALL SCORE AT THE  
18 END, AND I TOOK A COUPLE OF IMPORTANT THINGS I  
19 WANTED TO BE LAID OUT.

20 SO THE SCIENTIFIC APART, OVERALL I SHOULD  
21 POINT OUT HERE IT'S OVERWHELMINGLY POSITIVE ABOUT  
22 MANY ASPECTS. THERE'S A FEW POINTS BEING -- INDEED  
23 GOT POINTED OUT. AND AS I STATED IN THE LETTER, WE  
24 ACTUALLY IMPROVED AFTER THE SUBMISSION THAT'S IN  
25 FEBRUARY.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1            BESIDE THAT, I WANTED TO REALLY BRING UP A  
2            FEW NEW INFORMATION SINCE AFTER THE SUBMISSION OF  
3            THE GRANT. IMPORTANT EVENT OCCURRED LIKE IN THE  
4            FIELD OF THE (UNINTELLIGIBLE). SO IN MARCH, ACTUALLY  
5            ON MARCH 27TH, FDA APPROVED THE FIRST CELL-BASED  
6            GENE THERAPY, ABECMA, FROM CELGENE FOR TREATING  
7            MULTIPLE MYELOMA. IT'S THE FIRST APPROVED CELL  
8            THERAPY. IT'S AUTOLOGOUS CELL THERAPY AS YOU MAY  
9            EXPECT. IT'S PERSONAL TREATMENT. IT NEEDS A  
10            MANUFACTURING FACILITY. IT'S REALLY EXTREMELY  
11            EXPENSIVE. IT'S PRICED OVER \$400,000 PER PATIENT  
12            PER TREATMENT, AND IT'S NOT AVAILABLE TO ALL THE  
13            PATIENT WHO NEED. SO THE DELIVERY CAN BE DELAYED  
14            BECAUSE EVERY DOSE NEEDS TO BE MANUFACTURED  
15            SEPARATELY. SO THE DELAY MAY REALLY DELAY SAVING  
16            THE LIFE OF PATIENTS IN FAST PROGRESSING DISEASE.

17            SO THE KEY NEW PART OF OUR PROJECT THAT WE  
18            ARE PROPOSING HERE, OFF-THE-SHELF CELL THERAPY, I  
19            THINK SOMEHOW THIS POINT IS A LITTLE BIT MISSED BY  
20            PART OF THE GWG REVIEWER WHEN IT'S COMMON THAT SOME  
21            OF THE CRITICISM PROBABLY HAS A LITTLE BIT  
22            MISUNDERSTANDING TO EVALUATE THE THERAPY AS THE SAME  
23            AS THE AUTOLOGOUS LIKE THE PERSONAL THERAPY.

24            SO ACTUALLY SEE THAT THIS NEWLY APPROVED  
25            CELL THERAPY THE FDA APPROVED REALLY OPENS THE TIME

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FOR THE CELL THERAPY FOR TREATING MM. THE CURRENT  
2 THERAPY HAVE MANY LIMITATIONS, REALLY FOR LIMITING  
3 THE SERVING FOR THE UNDERSERVED COMMUNITY. IT'S A  
4 HIGH PRICE; IT'S HARDER TO DELIVER IT. IT'S NOT  
5 AVAILABLE TO ALL THE PATIENTS. IN FACT, IT'S ONLY  
6 AVAILABLE TO A VERY SMALL POPULATION OF THE  
7 PATIENTS. AND THE THERAPY WE ARE TRYING TO DELIVER  
8 REALLY TRY TO OVERCOME ALL THOSE LIMITATIONS.

9 AGAIN, I WANT TO EMPHASIZE IT'S  
10 OFF-THE-SHELF IMMUNOCELL THERAPY. AND AS POINTED  
11 OUT, THERE ARE OTHER LINES OF OFF-THE-SHELF CELL  
12 THERAPY AND THE DEVELOPMENT, YES, CORRECT, BUT THEY  
13 ARE ALL AT A QUITE EARLY STAGE AT THIS MOMENT. AND  
14 CIRM'S MISSION IS TO SPEED UP THE DELIVERY OF THE  
15 THERAPY, THE LIFESAVING THERAPY, TO THE PATIENTS.  
16 AND FUNDING THIS PROJECT LIKE EARLY, IT WILL SAVE  
17 US -- NEXT FUNDING PERIOD IS HALF A YEAR AWAY. THAT  
18 WILL BE DELAYED AT LEAST HALF A YEAR FOR DEVELOPING  
19 A THERAPY THAT MAY BE COMING REALLY AVAILABLE FOR  
20 THE PATIENTS.

21 SO I ALSO HAVE MY CLINICAL COLLABORATOR,  
22 DR. SARAH LARSON, ON THE MEETING. SO SHE MAY LIKE  
23 TO MAKE SOME COMMENTS FROM THE PATIENT POINT OF  
24 VIEW, SAY THAT IT'S AN URGENT NEED FOR THE PATIENTS  
25 WHO ARE IN NEED OF THIS THERAPY IN PLACE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SO I ALSO MENTION THAT FOR FASTER, SPEEDY  
2 TRANSLATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT PATH, WE CITE A  
3 STRONG TEAM AND A GOOD RECORD IN THE PAST ON TRAN1  
4 PROJECT. WE FORMED THE INDUSTRIAL PARTNERSHIP TO  
5 DEVELOP THIS THERAPY. IT'S A CALIFORNIA-BASED  
6 START-UP COMPANY FOCUSED ON THIS LINE OF THE  
7 TECHNOLOGY AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS THERAPY.  
8 ALTHOUGH MULTIPLE MYELOMA IS NOT IMMEDIATELY ON  
9 THEIR PIPELINE, BUT AS YOU MAY SEE FROM THE SUPPORT  
10 LETTER FROM THE COMPANY, THAT THEY ARE SUPPORTIVE OF  
11 THIS PROJECT. THEY ARE WAITING TO SHARE THE CMC OR  
12 THE CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT OR EXPERIENCE AND MAYBE  
13 LATER ON ADD TO THE STAGE, JOIN THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
14 THIS ONE. SO THIS ONE LAYS A PATH FOR REALLY FAST  
15 TRANSLATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THIS THERAPY.

16 I WILL CLOSE AND REALLY THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
17 PATIENCE. AGAIN, I REALLY APPRECIATE FOR THE ICOC'S  
18 CONSIDERATION OF THIS APPLICATION. THANK YOU.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. YANG. I  
20 SHOULD POINT OUT THAT OUR PUBLIC COMMENT SHOULD BE  
21 THREE MINUTES IN LENGTH. THAT PROBABLY EXCEEDED  
22 THAT. OBVIOUSLY THE COMMENTS ARE IMPORTANT, BUT FOR  
23 FUTURE PUBLIC COMMENT HERE, PLEASE TRY TO KEEP IT TO  
24 THE THREE-MINUTE MARK.

25 WE HAVE SARAH LARSON FOR PUBLIC COMMENT;

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IS THAT CORRECT?

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES, IT IS. SARAH, YOU  
3 NEED TO UNMUTE YOUR PHONE.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SARAH, BEFORE YOU BEGIN  
5 HERE, WE HAVE A BOARD QUESTION. MARK  
6 FISCHER-COLBRIE HAS A QUESTION. SARAH, HOLD ON ONE  
7 SECOND. WE HAVE A BOARD MEMBER WHO HAS A COMMENT  
8 FIRST BEFORE YOU BEGIN.

9 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN.  
10 I DIDN'T KNOW IF THERE'S ADDITIONAL COMMENTARY THAT  
11 GIL MIGHT HAVE THAT MIGHT FURTHER ELUCIDATE THE  
12 VOTE. THAT MIGHT BE HELPFUL AT THIS JUNCTURE.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WHY DON'T WE HOLD THAT  
14 QUESTION TILL WE GET THE SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT HERE  
15 AND THEN WE'LL TURN TO GIL, IF THAT'S OKAY, MARK.

16 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: THANK YOU SO MUCH.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SARAH.

18 DR. LARSON: YES. I'M THE CLINICAL PI AND  
19 DIRECTOR OF THE MYELOMA PROGRAM AND IMMUNOVECTOR  
20 CELL PROGRAM AT UCLA. I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR THE  
21 OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK ON THIS PROJECT.

22 I'M VERY EXCITED THAT THERE'S A  
23 BCMA-DIRECTED CELL THERAPY PRODUCT AVAILABLE, BUT IT  
24 CERTAINLY HAS LIMITATIONS BOTH WITH RESPECT TO  
25 EFFICACY AND TOXICITY AS WELL AS ITS AVAILABILITY.

1 AND WITH THE EFFICACY AND TOXICITY, PART OF THAT HAS  
2 TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT THERE'S A MANUFACTURING  
3 TIME REQUIRED. SO BY THE TIME THE PATIENTS CAN GET  
4 THE PRODUCT BACK, THEIR DISEASE HAS USUALLY FURTHER  
5 PROGRESSED, AND IT MAKES GOING THROUGH THE THERAPY  
6 MORE DIFFICULT FOR THEM.

7 THE OTHER POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE  
8 OFF-THE-SHELF OPTIONS HAVE OTHER SIDE EFFECTS THAT  
9 WOULDN'T BE INVOLVED IN THIS PRODUCT, THINGS LIKE  
10 GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE OR MORE LIKELIHOOD OF  
11 REJECTION BECAUSE THEY'RE USING ALLOGENEIC T-CELLS  
12 INSTEAD OF INKT-CELLS.

13 THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS IS THE  
14 AVAILABILITY, AND IT'S FOR ALL POPULATIONS. THIS  
15 WOULD BE ABLE TO REACH THE UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS,  
16 AND EVEN PATIENTS NOW ARE HAVING DIFFICULTY WITH THE  
17 AVAILABILITY OF THE BCMA-DIRECTED CAR-T CELL BECAUSE  
18 THE COMMERCIALY AVAILABLE PRODUCT HAS LIMITED  
19 MANUFACTURING SLOTS, MEANING PATIENTS THAT ARE  
20 PRESENTED NOW FOR THE THERAPY MAY NOT BE ABLE TO GET  
21 IT FOR MONTHS. AND THE CLINICAL TRIALS WITH THE  
22 OTHER CAR-T CELLS HAVE LIMITED SLOT AVAILABILITY  
23 THAT REALLY HIGHLIGHTS THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL CELL  
24 THERAPY FOR MYELOMA PATIENTS EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE  
25 OPTIONS OUT THERE.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1                   AND SOME OF THE STRENGTHS OF THIS PROPOSAL  
2                   THAT DR. YANG MADE I THINK FURTHER SHOW WHERE THIS  
3                   COULD HAVE A PLACE FOR OUR MYELOMA PATIENTS IN  
4                   CALIFORNIA.

5                   CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU FOR THAT  
6                   COMMENT.

7                   IS THERE OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS  
8                   BEFORE WE TURN TO GIL? HEARING NONE, GIL, COULD YOU  
9                   ADDRESS MARK'S QUESTION PLEASE?

10                  DR. SAMBRANO: CERTAINLY. SO MAYBE I CAN  
11                  TRY TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE MORE FLAVOR WITH SOME OF  
12                  THE COMMENTS THAT RELATE TO THIS APPLICATION. I  
13                  THINK, AGAIN, GENERALLY THERE WAS SOME ENTHUSIASM  
14                  WITH THE IDEA OF DEVELOPING AN ALLOGENEIC APPROACH.  
15                  CERTAINLY THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS RECOGNIZED BY  
16                  REVIEWERS; BUT I THINK, GIVEN THE RECENT APPROVAL OF  
17                  ANOTHER CAR-T, ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THAT IS AN  
18                  AUTOLOGOUS APPROACH, I THINK WHAT THEY WERE LOOKING  
19                  FOR WAS ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS THAT SHOW SOME  
20                  COMPARABILITY. THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE ONE THAT  
21                  HAS ALREADY BEEN APPROVED, IF THAT APPROACH WORKS,  
22                  COULD YOU DEVELOP THAT INTO AN ALLOGENEIC APPROACH?

23                  OF COURSE, THERE'S POTENTIAL ADVANTAGES OF  
24                  THE ONE THAT IS PROPOSED BECAUSE IT HAS SORT OF A  
25                  TRIPLE TARGETING APPROACH IN TERMS OF WHAT IT CAN

1 DO. SO I THINK THERE IS PROMISE.

2 BUT ALSO AT THE SAME TIME THERE WERE SOME  
3 CONCERNS RELATED, FOR EXAMPLE, TO INSERTIONAL  
4 MUTAGENESIS IN HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS THAT NEEDS  
5 TO BE ADDRESSED IN SOME OF THE STUDIES. IT PRESENTS  
6 A POTENTIAL MAJOR RISK FACTOR IN DEVELOPING THIS  
7 BECAUSE OF THE LENTIVIRAL APPROACH THAT IS BEING  
8 USED.

9 IT WAS ALSO NOTED THAT THE DATA SHARING  
10 PLAN WAS NOT ADEQUATE ENOUGH OR NONRESPONSIVE IN THE  
11 WORDS OF SOME OF THE REVIEWERS, AND THEY WOULD LIKE  
12 TO SEE MORE RELATED TO THAT.

13 THERE WAS ALSO A QUESTION IN TERMS OF THE  
14 TARGETS FOR THE CAR BECAUSE THERE ARE MULTIPLE  
15 TARGETS, SOME OF THEM IN SOME CASES OF MULTIPLE  
16 MYELOMA ARE REDUCED AND/OR MAY BECOME INACTIVE OR  
17 LOST IN SOME OF THE PATIENTS. SO I THINK THEY WOULD  
18 HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN MORE DISCUSSION RELATED TO  
19 THAT. I THINK THOSE ARE POINTS THAT THE GRANTS  
20 WORKING GROUP WOULD LIKE TO SEE ADDRESSED IN SOME  
21 WAY.

22 BUT, AGAIN, IN GENERAL, THERE IS CERTAINLY  
23 ENTHUSIASM FOR HAVING AN ALLOGENEIC APPROACH AND THE  
24 IDEA OF CREATING AN INTERESTING TRIPLE TARGETING  
25 APPROACH THAT COULD HAVE AN IMPACT. SO THAT'S ALL I

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THINK I CAN ADD TO THAT.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. ANY  
3 OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,  
4 ON THIS MOTION?

5 DR. STEWARD: YEAH. THIS IS OS. CAN I  
6 MAKE A QUICK COMMENT?

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SURE, OS.

8 DR. STEWARD: WITH REGARD TO DATA SHARING,  
9 I JUST --

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OS, YOU'RE KIND OF HARD  
11 TO HEAR.

12 DR. STEWARD: SORRY. CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW?

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S BETTER, YES.

14 DR. STEWARD: I PROPOSE A FRIENDLY  
15 AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION THAT, IF APPROVED FOR  
16 FUNDING, IS CONTINGENT ON AN ACCEPTABLE DATA SHARING  
17 PLAN. THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, DID YOU GET THAT?

19 MR. HARRISON: I DID. I BELIEVE OS WAS  
20 MAKING A REQUEST TO THE MAKER OF THE MOTION AND THE  
21 SECOND ABOUT WHETHER THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO ACCEPT  
22 A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT, THAT THE APPROVAL OF THE AWARD  
23 WOULD BE CONTINGENT UPON THE APPLICANT AGREEING TO A  
24 REASONABLE DATA SHARING PLAN.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YSABEL IS THE MAKER OF

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE MOTION. STEVE IS THE SECOND. DO YOU ACCEPT  
2 THAT FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?

3 MS. DURON: ABSOLUTELY. I FIND THAT VERY  
4 REASONABLE. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S THE ONLY  
5 ARGUMENT, IF ANYBODY ELSE WILL ACCEPT THAT, BUT I  
6 DO.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: STEVE?

8 MR. JUELSGAARD: JUST REALLY ONE QUICK  
9 QUESTION. WHO WILL BE THE APPROVER OF AN ADEQUATE  
10 DATA SHARING PLAN? WHOSE AUTHORIZATION IS GOING TO  
11 BE REQUIRED IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE?

12 MR. HARRISON: STEVE, GENERALLY WHEN THE  
13 BOARD HAS IMPOSED THESE KINDS OF CONDITIONS IN THE  
14 PAST, THEY HAVE VESTED THE CIRM TEAM WITH THE  
15 AUTHORITY TO MAKE THOSE JUDGMENTS.

16 DR. STEWARD: (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'M NOT SURE WE GOT  
18 THAT, OS. COULD YOU REPEAT THAT PLEASE?

19 DR. STEWARD: I JUST SAID THAT WAS THE  
20 INTENT OF MY MOTION. THANK YOU.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

22 MR. JUELSGAARD: JAMES, BY CIRM TEAM, DO  
23 YOU MEAN MARIA MILLAN?

24 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT. MARIA MILLAN AS  
25 PRESIDENT WOULD HAVE THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY TO MAKE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT DECISION.

2 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. THEN I ACCEDE TO  
3 THAT REQUEST TO AMEND THE MOTION.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO WE HAVE THE  
5 MOTION AS AMENDED ON A FRIENDLY BASIS TO INCLUDE THE  
6 DATA SHARING ELEMENT. ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS  
7 OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? HEARING  
8 NONE, MARIA, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

10 MS. DURON: JONATHAN, ARE WE VOTING ON A  
11 REVIEW, GOING BACK TO REVIEW, OR ARE WE VOTING ON  
12 THAT IT BE ACCEPTED FOR FUNDING WITH THIS CAVEAT?

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE'RE VOTING ON YOUR  
14 MOTION, WHICH, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IS TO APPROVE  
15 THIS GRANT --

16 MS. DURON: OKAY.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: -- AS MODIFIED BY THE  
18 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT.

19 MS. DURON: THANK YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANNE-MARIE.

21 DR. DULIEGE: JUST TO SAY THAT NO MATTER  
22 WHAT THE OUTCOME OF OUR BOARD IS GOING TO BE, I JUST  
23 WANT TO SAY HOW COMFORTED I AM BY HOW CAREFULLY WE  
24 AS A TEAM ARE DOING OUR JOB, WHICH IS NOT ALWAYS TO  
25 VOTE ON THE CONSENSUS FROM THE ICOC, BUT TO HAVE AN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OPEN-MINDED DEBATE ABOUT PROS AND CONS. I MEAN  
2 THERE'S NO CLEAR ANSWER TO THAT. IF THERE WAS ONE,  
3 WE WOULD NOT EVEN HAVE THE DEBATE. BUT I HOPE THE  
4 PUBLIC AND THE CIRM IN GENERAL SEE THAT AS AN  
5 EXAMPLE OF ESSENTIALLY THE ICOC DOING ITS JOB  
6 CAREFULLY.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.  
8 MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., WASN'T SARAH LARSON  
10 GOING TO GIVE PUBLIC COMMENT?

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'M SORRY. WHAT?

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: WASN'T THERE MORE PUBLIC  
13 COMMENT? I BELIEVE WE HAD PUBLIC COMMENT.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SHE COMMENTED ALREADY.  
15 I DON'T KNOW IF SHE HAS ADDITIONAL COMMENT, BUT SHE  
16 SPOKE ALREADY.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: OKAY.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. MARIA.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

20 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

22 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

24 MS. DURON: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.  
3 DR. FLOWERS: NO.  
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
5 DR. HIGGINS: NO.  
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
7 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
9 DR. MARTIN: NO.  
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
11 DR. MIASKOWSKI: NO.  
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
13 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.  
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.  
15 MR. ROWLETT: NO.  
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN  
17 THOMAS.  
18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS IS COMING BACK IN.  
20 OS, WERE YOU GOING TO VOTE ON THAT? OS? YOU'RE ON  
21 MUTE.  
22 JAMES, CAN YOU HELP? I BELIEVE THE MOTION  
23 CARRIES; IS THAT CORRECT?  
24 MR. HARRISON: YES. SEVEN TO FIVE.  
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. STEWARD: CAN YOU HEAR ME?

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

3 DR. STEWARD: I'M SORRY IF I'M GOING TO  
4 THROW A MONKEY WRENCH, BUT MY VOTE IS NO.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: I STILL THINK WE ARE  
6 OKAY. THANK YOU.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THAT PROJECT  
8 HAS BEEN APPROVED.

9 DO WE HAVE ANY OTHER REQUESTS TO MOVE ANY  
10 OF THE OTHER ITEMS BELOW THE GREEN LEVEL UP TO THE  
11 GREEN LEVEL FOR CONSIDERATION FOR FUNDING? OKAY.

12 HEARING NONE, WE MOVE NOW UP TO THE  
13 PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AND  
14 WOULD LIKE TO TAKE EACH INDIVIDUALLY. DO WE HEAR A  
15 MOTION TO APPROVE THE FIRST PROJECT THERE, WHICH IS  
16 12345, IF I'M READING THAT CORRECTLY, OR IS IT  
17 12245?

18 DR. SAMBRANO: IT'S 12245.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WE HEAR A MOTION  
20 TO APPROVE?

21 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SO MOVED.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK THAT WAS BY  
23 MARK. IS THERE A SECOND?

24 MR. BERNAL: SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. IS THERE



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DISCUSSION OR QUESTIONS ON THIS ITEM BY MEMBERS OF  
2 THE BOARD? IS THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING  
3 NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

5 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

7 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

9 MS. DURON: YES.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

11 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

13 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.

15 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.

17 DR. MARTIN: I HAVE TO ABSTAIN BECAUSE I  
18 CAN TELL FROM THE DESCRIPTION WHO IT IS.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN. AL  
20 ROWLETT.

21 MR. ROWLETT: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN  
23 THOMAS.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON. DIANE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WINOKUR.

2 MR. GOLDSTEIN: MARIA, DID I FALL OFF THE  
3 LIST SOMEHOW?

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY, YOU CANNOT VOTE  
5 DURING THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. YOU CAN  
6 COMMENT, BUT NOT VOTE.

7 MR. GOLDSTEIN: GOT IT. THANK YOU.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, HAS THE MOTION  
9 PASSED?

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE SEVERAL MEMBERS  
11 THAT DROPPED OFF, SO IT MAKES IT A LITTLE TRICKIER.  
12 I BELIEVE SO. JAMES, WITH THE ABSTENTION,  
13 DOES IT --

14 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE WE'RE GOING TO  
15 HAVE TO HOLD THE ROLL OPEN ON THAT BECAUSE WE DON'T  
16 HAVE A QUORUM AMONG THE MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN  
17 THE VOTE. SO HOPEFULLY SOME OF THE OTHER MEMBERS  
18 WILL BE ABLE TO REJOIN.

19 DR. STEWARD: MARIA, I THINK I MISSED MY  
20 NAME. I'M A YES ON THIS.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: THAT HELPS. THANK YOU.  
22 I'M LOOKING FOR -- IF YOU CAN HOLD ON FOR A SECOND,  
23 I'M GOING TO TRY AND CALL A COUPLE OF THE BOARD  
24 MEMBERS THAT DROPPED OFF.

25 MR. HARRISON: MARIA, I BELIEVE WITH OS'

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 VOTE, WE ARE AT QUORUM.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: GREAT. THANK YOU.

3 MOTION CARRIES.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OKAY. NOW  
5 WE ARE ON TO THE LAST ITEM, WHICH IS -- WHAT IS THAT  
6 NUMBER, GIL?

7 DR. SAMBRANO: IT'S 12258.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. YOU CAN SEE  
9 THE DESCRIPTION THERE. THIS, AS SAID, WAS  
10 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE GWG. DO I HEAR A  
11 MOTION TO APPROVE?

12 DR. MARTIN: SO MOVED.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A SECOND?

14 MR. ROWLETT: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY AL ROWLETT.  
16 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? IS  
17 THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL  
18 YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUST ONE SECOND. I'M  
20 JUST DOUBLE-CHECKING THAT I DON'T CALL THE WRONG  
21 NAMES. LET'S LEAVE THAT THERE.

22 DAN BERNAL.

23 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

25 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.  
2 MS. DURON: YES.  
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.  
4 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.  
6 DR. FLOWERS: YES.  
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.  
8 DR. HIGGINS: YES.  
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.  
10 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.  
12 DR. MARTIN: YES.  
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
14 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.  
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.  
16 MR. ROWLETT: YES.  
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.  
18 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.  
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.  
22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. OKAY.  
23 THAT CONCLUDES THE ITEM WITH REGARD TO OUR  
24 TRANSLATIONAL PROJECTS.  
25 MR. HARRISON: J.T., WE NEED TO TAKE A

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MOTION TO CLOSE OUT THE REMAINING APPLICATIONS; THAT  
2 IS, NOT TO FUND THE APPLICATIONS THAT REMAIN.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. DO WE  
4 HAVE A MOTION TO THAT EFFECT?

5 MR. JUELSGAARD: MOVE THAT WE CLOSE OUT  
6 THE APPLICATIONS THAT REMAIN.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A SECOND?

8 DR. MARTIN: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS OR  
10 COMMENT FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? ANY PUBLIC  
11 COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL  
12 THE ROLL.

13 MR. HARRISON: JUST A BRIEF REMINDER,  
14 MARIA, TO MEMBERS TO VOTE EITHER YES OR NO EXCEPT  
15 WITH RESPECT TO ANY APPLICATION WHICH YOU HAVE A  
16 CONFLICT.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

18 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

20 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

22 MS. DURON: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

24 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. FLOWERS: YES.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA, IT WOULD BE YES  
3 EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

4 DR. FLOWERS: THAT'S CORRECT. YES, EXCEPT  
5 THOSE FOR WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. DAVID  
7 HIGGINS.

8 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.

10 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.

12 DR. MARTIN: YES.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

14 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
15 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.

17 MR. ROWLETT: YES.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. JONATHAN  
19 THOMAS.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

22 MR. TORRES: AYE.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART, IT'S YES EXCEPT FOR  
24 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MR. TORRES: I'M SORRY. RIGHT. AYE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH WHICH I DO NOT HAVE A  
2 CONFLICT.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. KAROL WATSON.  
4 DIANE WINOKUR.

5 THE MOTION CARRIES.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. SO  
7 THAT THEN CLOSES OUT THE TRAN DISCUSSION AND VOTE.

8 WE ARE NOW TO GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON  
9 ANY ITEMS. HEARING NONE, I WANT TO THANK MARIA B.  
10 AND DOUG AND EVERYBODY WHO, AS ALWAYS, DOES A GREAT  
11 JOB IN FACILITATING THIS MEETING. WITHOUT ALL OF  
12 THAT WORK, NONE OF THIS WOULD BE POSSIBLE.

13 ALSO WANT TO GIVE A SPECIAL SHOUT-OUT TO  
14 ART'S DAUGHTER DANIELLE WHO JUST GRADUATED CUM LAUDE  
15 FROM UC HASTINGS LAW SCHOOL ON SATURDAY. SO  
16 CONGRATULATIONS, ART.

17 MR. TORRES: WE NOW HAVE ONE ELECTED  
18 OFFICIAL AND ONE EXTRA JURIS DOCTOR IN THE  
19 HOUSEHOLD. VERY PROUD PAPA HERE.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AS WELL YOU SHOULD BE.

21 MS. DURON: IT'S IN THE GENES.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO THAT WITH, MARIA,  
23 COULD YOU REMIND EVERYBODY WHAT THE DATE IS OF THE  
24 JUNE BOARD MEETING?

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: I SURE CAN. IT'S JUNE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 18TH. CAN'T WAIT TO SEE YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU AND  
3 THANKS VERY MUCH TO EVERYBODY WHO CONTRIBUTED HERE.  
4 AND WITH THAT, WE STAND ADJOURNED. HAVE A GREAT  
5 REST OF YOUR MAY AND EARLY JUNE, AND WE'LL SEE YOU  
6 JUNE 18TH. THANK YOU.

7 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 2:14 P.M.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



**REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MAY 17, 2021, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152  
133 HENNA COURT  
SANDPOINT, IDAHO  
(208) 920-3543