

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

BEFORE THE  
TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND MEDICINE TO THE  
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
TO THE  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: JULY 17, 2023  
1 P.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2023-24

**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
3. PRESENTATION ON NOVEL ORGANOID PHENOTYPING BY DR. FRED GAGE	5
4. CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT NEURO DISC CONCEPT PLAN	38
5. GENERAL DISCUSSION	60
6. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
7. ADJOURNMENT	90

**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

JULY 17, 2023; 1 P.M.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. WELCOME,  
EVERYBODY. WE HAVE TWO ITEMS TODAY. THE FIRST WILL  
BE A TALK FROM RUSTY GAGE. MARIANNE, CAN YOU CALL  
THE ROLL PLEASE BEFORE WE MOVE ON?

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YEAH. YOU WERE  
ON MUTE FOR ONE MINUTE. I'LL GO AHEAD AND CALL THE  
ROLL NOW.

MARIA BONNEVILLE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LEONDR  
CLARK-HARVEY. MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE. FRED FISHER.

DR. FISHER: FRED IS HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: JUDY GASSON.

DR. GASSON: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: DAVID HIGGINS.  
VITO IMBASCIANI.

DR. IMBASCIANI: YES. VINI, VIDI, VITO.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ALL RIGHT.  
STEVE JUELSGAARD.

MR. JUELSGAARD: PRESENT. PRESENT.  
PRESENT. SORRY.

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

1 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: GOTCHA. GOTCHA.

2 GOTCHA. OKAY. PAT LEVITT.

3 DR. LEVITT: PRESENT.

4 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LAUREN

5 MILLER-ROGEN. MARVIN SOUTHARD.

6 DR. SOUTHARD: PRESENT.

7 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: KEITH YAMAMOTO.

8 DR. YAMAMOTO: I'M HERE. HI, RUSTY.

9 DR. GAGE: HEY.

10 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ALL RIGHT. WE

11 ARE GOOD, AND WE DO HAVE A QUORUM, LARRY. SO YOU

12 MAY PROCEED.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU.

14 SO TWO ITEMS TODAY. THE FIRST WILL BE A

15 TALK FROM RUSTY GAGE, THAT I'LL INTRODUCE IN A

16 MOMENT. AND THE SECOND IS WE'LL HEAR A CONCEPT PLAN

17 FROM ROSA CANET-AVILES LAYING OUT A POSSIBLE FUNDING

18 SYSTEM FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC STEM CELL RESEARCH.

19 SO RUSTY WILL SPEAK FOR ABOUT 45 MINUTES,

20 INCLUDING QUESTIONS, AND THEN WE'LL GET ROSA UP.

21 SO RUSTY GAGE. DR. FRED GAGE HAS BEEN A

22 LONGTIME COLLEAGUE OF MINE. HE HAS A NUMBER OF

23 FIRSTS OVER THE YEARS, INCLUDING EVIDENCE THAT

24 THERE'S NEUROGENESIS IN HUMANS, SOME WONDERFUL STEM

25 CELL WORK OVER THE YEARS. AND THE REASON I THOUGHT

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

1 WE SHOULD HEAR FROM HIM TODAY IS, AS WE LAUNCH INTO  
2 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC STEM CELL RESEARCH, IT'S IMPORTANT  
3 THAT WE BE ABLE TO ANALYZE WHAT GOES WRONG IN  
4 MUTATIONS THAT PREDISPOSE TO SCHIZOPHRENIA OR  
5 BIPOLAR DISORDER OR ANY OF THE DISEASES THAT WE MAY  
6 TURN OUT TO BE INTERESTED IN. AND RUSTY'S LAB  
7 RECENTLY PUBLISHED WHAT I THINK IS ONE OF THE MOST  
8 ADVANCED PHENOTYPIC SYSTEMS FOR EVALUATING WHAT IS  
9 HAPPENING INSIDE OF BRAIN ORGANOID.

10 AND WITH NO ADDITIONAL VERBIAGE FROM ME,  
11 I'M GOING TO TURN IT OVER TO RUSTY. SO TAKE IT  
12 AWAY.

13 DR. GAGE: ALL RIGHT. I'M SCREEN SHARING  
14 NOW.

15 OKAY. WELL, THANKS FOR INVITING ME TO  
16 PRESENT. I'LL BE PRESENTING OUR EFFORTS TO DEVELOP  
17 A FULLY HUMAN BRAIN ORGANOID MODEL SYSTEM. IT WILL  
18 BE MOSTLY METHODOLOGICAL, BUT THERE ARE SOME  
19 CONCEPTUAL THINGS THAT I'D LIKE TO ADVANCE AS WELL.  
20 BUT HERE'S THE LAYOUT.

21 WHAT ARE OUR GOALS? WELL, THERE'S A LOT  
22 OF FOCUS LATELY IN THE LAST TEN YEARS OR SO ON  
23 DEVELOPING HUMAN BRAIN ORGANOID IN PART BECAUSE OF  
24 THE, LET'S SAY, LACK OF COMPLETE SATISFACTORY  
25 EVIDENCE FROM MOUSE MODELS, ESPECIALLY OF

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

1 PSYCHIATRIC DISEASES. AND THE ABILITY TO LOOK AT  
2 HUMAN BRAIN TISSUE IN MODELS OF THE HUMAN BRAIN IS  
3 HOPED TO ADVANCE OUR ABILITY MAKE NEW DISCOVERIES.

4 SO WITH THAT TOWARD THE ORGAN TREE OR  
5 ORGANOID, HUMAN ORGANOID, THERE'S A COUPLE OF  
6 THINGS THAT ARE PROBLEMATIC SO FAR. AND THAT IS  
7 THAT THE ORGANOID THAT HAVE BEEN AND ARE BEING USED  
8 IN VITRO ARE NOT VASCULARIZED. AND WHAT HAPPENS,  
9 BECAUSE OF THE 1 MILLIMETER RULE, THAT MEANS THINGS  
10 CAN'T DIFFUSE MORE THAN 1 MILLIMETER INTO THE  
11 ORGANOID. ONCE THEY GET LARGER THAN 2 MILLIMETERS  
12 IN SIZE, THE CORE BEGINS TO ROT. THE LARGER THEY  
13 GET, THE LARGER THE CORE BECOMES. AND IN MY MIND,  
14 IN OUR MIND, OUR LAB, IT'S VERY HARD TO MAKE  
15 CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE OUTER RIM OF AN ORGANOID WHEN  
16 YOU KNOW THAT THE INNER CORE IS DYING. WE NEED TO  
17 ELIMINATE -- WE NEED TO VASCULARIZE THE ORGANOID  
18 AND ELIMINATE THE NECROTIC CORE.

19 NEXT IS MOST OF THE ORGANOID THAT  
20 CURRENTLY EXIST ARE REALLY NEURAL ORGANOID.  
21 THEY'RE MADE UP OF NEURONS OR NEURAL PRECURSORS AND  
22 DON'T REALLY -- THEY'RE NOT REALLY IMBUE NATURALLY  
23 WITH OTHER CELL TYPES. AND, OF COURSE, THE BRAIN IS  
24 MADE UP OF MANY DIFFERENT CELL TYPES. AND ONCE YOU  
25 HAVE THESE -- AS YOU IMBUE THE ORGANOID WITH THESE

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

1 DIFFERENT CELL TYPES, YOU NEED TO ESTABLISH THEIR  
2 HEALTH AND FUNCTION AND DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY ARE  
3 RESPONDING AS ONE MIGHT EXPECT THEM TO RESPOND IN  
4 SITU.

5 I'LL GIVE YOU EVIDENCE TODAY ON NEURONS,  
6 MICROGLIA, AND ASTROCYTES AND IN-PROGRESS FOR  
7 ENDOTHELIAL CELLS AND PERICYTES, WHICH ARE THE CELLS  
8 IN THE BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER VASCULATURE, AND WITH A  
9 LONG-TERM PLAN OF MYELINATING THE AXONS WITHIN THE  
10 ORGANOID.

11 NOW, THE GOAL OBVIOUSLY IS ONCE -- AS WE  
12 MOVE THROUGH THIS, WE CAN BEGIN TO COMPARE HEALTHY  
13 BRAIN TO DISEASED BRAIN. AND REALLY IT'S DISEASE  
14 AGNOSTIC BECAUSE WITH IPS TECHNOLOGY YOU CAN GET  
15 FIBROBLASTS FROM ANY PATIENT AVAILABLE. ONCE THERE,  
16 YOU CAN DO WHAT WE CALL INDUCTIVE EXPERIMENTS WHERE  
17 YOU CAN REPLACE A HEALTHY CELL WITH A DISEASED CELL  
18 TO DETERMINE IF THAT DISEASE CELL IS DRIVING OR A  
19 CONSEQUENCE OR ACTIVATED AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE  
20 ENVIRONMENT THAT THEY FIND THEMSELVES. AND I'LL  
21 GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE OF MICROGLIA IN AUTISM.

22 RESTORATION IS ANOTHER APPROACH, AND THAT  
23 IS WHERE YOU HAVE A DISEASED BRAIN ORGANOID AND YOU  
24 REPLACE IT WITH HEALTHY CELLS TO SEE IF YOU CAN  
25 ELIMINATE SOME OF THE PATHOLOGY THAT EXISTS WITHIN

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

1 THE ORGANOID DISEASED BRAIN. OF COURSE, WITH THIS  
2 SYSTEM, BECAUSE IT'S LIVING AND MODULAR, WE CAN  
3 BEGIN TO IDENTIFY CELLULAR ANIMAL MECHANISMS THAT  
4 ARE CAUSING OR PREVENTING THESE CELLS TO BECOME  
5 HEALTHY.

6 AND IN THE FINAL CASE, WE THINK OF THIS  
7 MODEL SYSTEM AS A TOOL TO TEST THERAPIES IN THE  
8 HUMAN BRAIN AND PERHAPS OF THE PATIENT THAT IS BEING  
9 TREATED. SO TAKING A FIBROBLAST FROM THE PATIENT  
10 THAT'S GOING TO HAVE SOME SORT OF THERAPEUTIC  
11 INTERVENTION, YOU CAN ACTUALLY TEST THE DRUG, TEST  
12 THE VECTOR, TEST THE GENE THERAPY, TEST THE CELL  
13 THERAPY IN THE ORGANOID PRIOR TO GOING INTO THE  
14 PATIENT.

15 SO WITH THAT, WE CAN SAY THAT THERE ARE  
16 MANY DIFFERENT CELLS OF THE BRAIN. MOST OF THE  
17 ORGANOIDS THAT EXIST HAVE THESE -- CAN YOU SEE MY  
18 LITTLE ARROW THERE?

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES.

20 DR. GAGE: OKAY. WE DO SEE RADIAL GLIA IN  
21 THE EXISTING ORGANOIDS, AND THEY GIVE RISE TO  
22 NEURONS. THEY'RE LATE IN THE PROCESS. USUALLY FOUR  
23 OR FIVE MONTHS INTO IT, YOU WILL SEE ASTROCYTES  
24 FORMING IN THE OUTER CORE, BUT THEY DON'T -- THEY  
25 HAVEN'T BEEN TESTED YET FOR THEIR FUNCTIONALITY.

1 AND NEURAL OPC'S OR OLIGOS HAVE BEEN DETECTED SO  
2 FAR.

3 I'M GOING TO START BY TALKING TO YOU A  
4 LITTLE BIT ABOUT MICROGLIA. THESE ARE CELLS THAT  
5 ARE NOT EVEN DERIVED IN THE BRAIN, BUT THEY'RE  
6 DERIVED IN WHAT'S CALLED THE YOKE SACK, VERY EARLY  
7 STAGE IN DEVELOPMENT, WHERE THEY MIGRATE INTO THE  
8 PRIMORDIAL BRAIN, TAKE UP RESIDENCE, AND  
9 BECOME -- THEY PROLIFERATE ACTUALLY WHEN THEY'RE  
10 THERE, AND THEY TAKE UP RESIDENCE. ONCE THE  
11 PERICYTES FORM IN THE OUTER EDGES OF THE ENDOTHELIAL  
12 CELLS AND PREVENT THE GROWTH OF THESE CELLS OR  
13 MOVING THESE CELLS INTO THE BRAIN, YOU RELY PRETTY  
14 MUCH ON THE EXISTING MICROGLIA THAT CAME IN EARLY  
15 ON. HOWEVER, BONE MARROW-DERIVED MACROPHAGES OR  
16 MYELOID ORIGIN CELLS CAN MIGRATE INTO THE BRAIN ALSO  
17 UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES. SO WE HAVE TWO  
18 SOURCES, EARLY DEVELOPMENT AND LATE DEVELOPMENT ON  
19 MICROGLIA. BUT, AGAIN, THEY'RE NOT BRAIN DERIVED.  
20 THEY ARE (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

21 A LOT OF INTEREST IN MICROGLIA LATELY  
22 SUGGESTED THEIR ROLE IN A VARIETY OF DISEASES,  
23 PARTICULARLY THEIR ROLE IN INFLAMMATION. AND SO A  
24 LOT OF WORK HAS BEEN -- I'M TRYING TO CHARACTERIZE.  
25 OF COURSE, VERIFIED BY BEN BARRES EARLY ON,

1 ESTABLISHING WHAT IS A MICROGLIAL IDENTITY, BOTH  
2 DEVELOPMENTAL AND MATURE. WE WERE INVOLVED IN  
3 ISOLATING MICROGLIA DIRECTLY OUT OF THE BRAIN. BUT  
4 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT HAPPENS WITH MICROGLIA IN  
5 VITRO IS THEY'RE VERY SENSITIVE TO THE ENVIRONMENT.  
6 AND WHEN THEY GO INTO AN IN-VITRO SETTING, THEY  
7 DOWNREGULATE KEY PROTEINS THAT ARE THOUGHT TO BE  
8 ESSENTIAL FOR THE FEATURES AND FUNCTION OF  
9 MICROGLIA, INCLUDING THESE GENES HERE.

10 I'M NOT GOING TO GO TOO MUCH INTO SPECIFIC  
11 GENES UNLESS THERE'S INTEREST FROM THE GROUP. I CAN  
12 GIVE YOU MORE DETAIL IN THE DISCUSSION SECTION. BUT  
13 THE FACT IS THEY ARE MICROGLIA IN VITRO, BUT THEY'RE  
14 NOT FULLY MATURED.

15 SO WHAT WE'VE DONE IS WE'VE TAKEN OUR  
16 REGULAR ORGANOID AND WE MAKE ERYTHRO-MYELOID CELLS.  
17 SO WE TAKE A FIBROBLAST AND TURN IT INTO AN IPS  
18 CELL, AND WE GENERATE BASICALLY EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF  
19 HEMATOPOIETIC CELLS AND THEN DRIVE THEM SLIGHTLY  
20 LESS -- SLIGHTLY INTO THE PHASE WHERE WE KNOW FROM  
21 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT THAT THEY MIGRATE INTO THE BRAIN  
22 IN ABOUT THREE TO FOUR MONTHS -- WEEKS OF AGE. AND  
23 SO HERE WE HAVE THE GREEN AS THE ORGANOID, AND HERE  
24 WE HAVE OUR INDUCED MYELOID PROGENITOR CELLS ON THE  
25 OUTSIDE. AND YOU CAN SEE IN THE MOVIE THAT THEY'RE

1       MIGRATING IN OVER A PERIOD OF TIME AND THEY SETTLE  
2       IN THE BRAIN.

3               NOW, I'M NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH IT, BUT  
4       WE AND OTHERS HAVE DONE A SERIES OF EXPERIMENTS  
5       TRYING TO GET MICROGLIA INTO THE ORGANOID, AND THEY  
6       DON'T SURVIVE VERY WELL.  THEY REQUIRE SEVERAL  
7       HUMAN-DERIVED PROTEINS THAT PROTECT THE SURVIVAL OF  
8       THE MICROGLIA.  WITHOUT THEM, THEY DON'T SURVIVE.  
9       AND EVEN WITH THOSE ADDED PROTEINS IN VITRO, THE  
10      MICROGLIA DO NOT SURVIVE MORE THAN A MONTH, AND THEY  
11      ARE IN WHAT'S CALLED A REACTIVE STATE.  SO THEY'RE  
12      NOT NATURALLY FORMED.

13              WE FOUND BACK IN -- WE DEVELOPED A MODEL  
14      IN 2018 WHERE WE TAKE AN ORGANOID AND WE CAN FORM IT  
15      AND THEN TRANSPLANT IT INTO THE RETROSPLENIAL CORTEX  
16      OVERLYING THE VASCULAR BED.  AND SO IT'S OVERLYING  
17      THIS PERI-COLLICULUS.  AND THE BLOOD VESSELS FROM  
18      THIS PERI-COLLICULUS GO INTO THE BRAIN, TO THE HUMAN  
19      ORGANOID, AND YOU CAN SEE HERE, AFTER AN  
20      INTERORBITAL INJECTION OF DYE, THAT THE BLOOD-BRAIN  
21      BARRIER IS FORMED AND THERE'S NO LEAKINESS INTO THE  
22      HOST.

23              WHEN WE TRANSPLANT THE MICROGLIA-ENRICHED  
24      ORGANOIDS INTO THE BRAIN, WE SEE LIVELY, FULLY  
25      MATURE MICROGLIA.  THESE ARE LABELED WITH TDTOMATO

1       HERE, BUT DOUBLE LABEL WITH IBA1, A MARKER FOR  
2       MICROGLIA. WE CAN DO THIS IN SOME DETAIL  
3       QUANTITATIVELY. AND NOW WE CAN SEE IN VIVO THAT  
4       THESE GENES THAT PREVIOUSLY WERE NOT ON IN VITRO ARE  
5       NOW BEING EXPRESSED IN THE MICROGLIA. SO IN VIVO  
6       SETTING.

7                   INTERESTINGLY, THE CF1 RECEPTOR, WHICH IS  
8       A SURVIVAL RECEPTOR IN THE GENE FOR MICROGLIA IN  
9       HUMANS UNIQUELY TO MOUSE, IS BEING EXPRESSED IN OUR  
10      ORGANOID, HUMAN ORGANOID. SO WE DO NOT HAVE TO ADD  
11      OR ENGINEER THE CELLS IN ANY WAY. THEY'RE NATURALLY  
12      SURVIVING. IBA1, HERE ARE THESE MARKERS, ADDITIONAL  
13      MARKERS FOR MICROGLIA.

14                   TO SORT OF CONFIRM THAT THEY REALLY ARE IN  
15      A MATURED FORM, WE HAVE LOOKED AT SINGLE-CELL  
16      SEQUENCING AT 6 WEEKS, 11, AND 24 WEEKS AFTER  
17      TRANSPLANTATION. AND WE DO OUR UMAP ANALYSIS HERE,  
18      AND YOU CAN SEE THAT THEY -- THESE ARE COLOR CODED  
19      FOR THE SENSOME GENOME. SO PICKMAN SOME TIME AGO  
20      EXTRACTED HUMAN MICROGLIA FROM THE HUMAN BRAIN AND  
21      ANALYZED GENES THAT ARE IMPORTANT FOR WHAT IS CALLED  
22      A SENSOME. SO MICROGLIA HAVE THIS INTERESTING  
23      PROPERTY WHERE THEY SENSE DANGER OR DAMAGE IN THE  
24      ENVIRONMENT AND THEY ATTACK, DESTROY CELLS THAT MAY  
25      BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE CELL. WHAT IS CONCEPTUALLY

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

1 BUILT INTO THIS IS THAT WHEN MICROGLIA BECOME  
2 OVERACTIVE, THEY BEGIN HARMING OR HURTING THE  
3 EXISTING HEALTHY BRAIN AS WELL.

4 SO WE ARE SEEING THAT THERE'S AN  
5 UPREGULATION OF THESE SENSOME GENES. THEY BECOME  
6 MORE ACTIVE AND ALSO GENES THAT WE AND OTHERS HAVE  
7 DISCOVERED TO BE IMPORTANT FOR MAINTAINING THE  
8 ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY OF THE MICROGLIA.

9 SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE CAN DO WITH  
10 THIS MODEL IS WE CAN PUT A GLASS COVERSIP OVER THE  
11 TOP OF THE MOUSE'S BRAIN. THESE ARE NON-SCID MICE.  
12 THEY'RE IMMUNOCOMPROMISED. AND WE PUT A 2-PHOTON  
13 MICROSCOPE OVER THE TOP OF THE ANESTHETIZED ANIMALS,  
14 AND WE CAN WATCH THE MICROGLIA AS THEY SENSE THE  
15 ENVIRONMENT. THIS WAS AN EXPERIMENT DONE TEN YEARS  
16 AGO IN MICE FOR THE FIRST TIME BY AXEL NIMMERJAHN.  
17 AND HE'S NOW A FACULTY MEMBER AT THE SALK. HE WAS  
18 ABLE TO SEE HUMAN MICROGLIA BEHAVING IN MANY WAYS  
19 THE SAME WAY. WHAT'S INTERESTING, THEY SURVEY THEIR  
20 ENVIRONMENT, BUT THEY DON'T TOUCH EACH OTHER, BUT IS  
21 SENSING FOR TOXINS IN THE ENVIRONMENT.

22 WE KNOW THESE CELLS ARE RESPONSIVE. SO WE  
23 CAN GIVE AN INFLAMMATORY INJECTION OF WHAT'S CALLED  
24 LIPOPOLYSACCHARIDE, WHICH INDUCES AN INFLAMMATORY  
25 RESPONSE. AND HERE'S THE CONTROL AND HERE'S 24

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

1 HOURS AFTER INJECTION. AND THEY ROUND UP AND APPEAR  
2 MUCH MORE LIKE A PHAGOCYtic CELL. THESE PHAGOCYtic  
3 CELLS ARE WHAT ARE CALLED REACTIVE MICROGLIA, AND  
4 THEY'RE NOT DOING THEIR HEALTHY JOB. THEY'RE  
5 ACTUALLY CAUSING TOXICITY, SECRETING A LOT OF  
6 UNHEALTHY MOLECULES INTO THE ENVIRONMENT.

7 NOW, INTERESTINGLY, WHEN WE KILL A CELL  
8 RIGHT BETWEEN TWO OF THESE -- FOUR OF THESE  
9 MICROGLIA, WE END UP SEEING HOW THE MICROGLIA  
10 ACTUALLY RESPOND. SO NORMALLY WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IS  
11 THAT THE MOUSE MICROGLIA, AS WE'VE LEARNED IN THE  
12 PAST, MIGRATE IN AND SURROUND AND DESTROY THE CELL.  
13 BUT HUMAN CELLS BEHAVE DIFFERENTLY. THEY WORK  
14 COORDINATELY, RESPONDING TO THEIR ENVIRONMENT AND  
15 SEND OUT THEIR PROCESS OF RETAINING THEIR POSITION  
16 IN THEIR QUADRANT. SO THIS WAS ACTUALLY A NEW  
17 DISCOVERY OF HOW HUMAN MICROGLIA BEHAVE DIFFERENTLY  
18 THAN DO MICE, THE ONLY TWO SPECIES IN WHICH WE'VE  
19 BEEN ABLE TO SEE LIVING IMAGES OF HOW THEY FUNCTION.

20 NOW, ONE OF THE ADVANTAGES OF THIS THAT WE  
21 KNEW WE COULD EXPLOIT IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT IS  
22 THE CELLS THEMSELVES, LET'S SAY THE MICROGLIA, WHICH  
23 ARE INDUCING A REACTIVITY WITHIN THE HOST, OR IS THE  
24 HOST ACTIVATING THE MICROGLIA TO BECOME AN INFLAMED  
25 CELL TYPE? WE'VE BEEN PREVIOUSLY WORKING WITH AN

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

1 AUTISTIC SUBGROUP OF INDIVIDUALS THAT HAVE LARGE  
2 BRAINS. THESE ARE MACROCEPHALIA. AND ONE OF THE  
3 THINGS THAT'S BEEN SHOWN BOTH IN PET AND HISTOLOGY  
4 IN THESE PATIENTS IS THEY HAVE AN INCREASE IN  
5 MICROGLIA MORPHOLOGICAL RESPONSES, SUGGESTING AN  
6 INFLAMED STATE OR A MACROPHAGIC STATE.

7 SO WE MADE ORGANOIDS FROM OUR CONTROL, AND  
8 WE SEE -- AND IMBUED THEM WITH HEALTHY -- THESE ARE  
9 ISOGENIC MICROGLIA, AND THEY BEHAVE WELL AND LOOK  
10 GOOD. HOWEVER, WHEN WE IMBUED THEM WITH THE -- WHEN  
11 WE TOOK THE ASD, THAT'S THE AUTISM SPECTRUM  
12 DISORDER, BRAIN ORGANOID AND IMBUED THEM WITH THEIR  
13 OWN MICROGLIA, THEY WERE INFLAMED. SO THAT'S THE  
14 BASELINE. AND THEN THE QUESTION BECOMES IS IT THE  
15 BRAIN THAT'S ACTIVATING THE MICROGLIA OR THE  
16 MICROGLIA ACTIVATING THE BRAIN?

17 IN THIS ONE EXPERIMENT, WE JUST DID THE  
18 LATTER PIECE, WHICH IS TO TAKE AN ASD ORGANOID AND  
19 IMPLANTED THEM WITH NEUROTYPICAL MICROGLIA VERSUS,  
20 OF COURSE, CONTROL ORGANOID IN NEUROTYPICAL  
21 ORGANOID. AND HERE IS THE CONTROL WITH  
22 NEUROTYPICAL ORGANOID, HEALTHY LONG BRANCHES. AND  
23 IN THIS CASE YOU SEE THAT THEY ARE ACTIVATED. WE  
24 CAN NOW SORT THESE MICROGLIA AND THE SURROUNDING  
25 BRAIN AREA AND ARE BEGINNING TO UNDERSTAND THE

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

1 MOLECULAR SIGNALS FROM THE BRAIN WHICH ARE  
2 ACTIVATING THESE MICROGLIA.

3 SO WHAT I SHOWED YOU SO FAR IS THAT  
4 MICROGLIA PROGENITOR CELLS EFFICIENTLY POPULATES THE  
5 DEVELOPING HUMAN BRAIN ORGANOID. THE LONG-TERM  
6 DIFFERENTIATION WAS ALWAYS HAMPERED IN VITRO, THUS  
7 LIMITING THEIR USE. WE DEVELOPED A METHOD FOR  
8 CHIMERIC-TRANSPLANTATION PARADIGM, ALLOWING US TO  
9 STUDY HUMAN MICROGLIA INSIDE TO OUR HUMAN BRAIN.  
10 THEY SURVIVE, MATURE. THEY ACQUIRE IN VIVO-LIKE  
11 RESTING PROPERTIES, BUT CAN RESPOND TO STIMULI IN  
12 PREDICTED DIRECTION. AND WE CAN LEARN NEW THINGS  
13 ABOUT HOW HUMANS ARE DIFFERENT ADULTS, AND WE CAN  
14 BEGIN TO TAKE THESE STUDIES INTO A DISEASE CONTEXT  
15 AS WELL.

16 I'D LIKE TO STEP BACK AND SAY WE ARE STILL  
17 MISSING MANY OTHER CELLS IN HERE. I'M SHOWING RIGHT  
18 NOW SOME UNPUBLISHED RESULTS ON ASTROCYTES. WE  
19 DEVELOPED A PROTOCOL WHERE WE CAN USE A SERIES -- WE  
20 CAN INCUBATE OUR ORGANOIDS IN GLIAL-PROMOTING  
21 FACTORS WHICH CAN INDUCE A RAPID DEVELOPMENT AND  
22 MATURATION OF GLIA IN THE ORGANOIDS THEMSELVES.

23 A GENE THAT HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED VERY EARLY  
24 ON BY LAWRENCE STUDER AND HIS TEAM WAS NF1A IS  
25 THOUGHT TO BE AN IMPORTANT TRANSCRIPTION FACTOR THAT

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

1 ENABLES ASTROCYTE DIFFERENCES. AND WE FOUND THAT  
2 WITH OUR CONDITIONING MEDIA WE GET NF1A EXPRESSION  
3 AS EARLY AS 21 DAYS IN VITRO. THIS IS ALL IN VITRO.  
4 BY 60 DAYS WE HAVE A FULLY REPRESENTED ASTROCYTE  
5 POPULATION THROUGHOUT THE ORGANOID. AND WHEN WE DO  
6 SINGLE-CELL SEQUENCING IN TEN-WEEK OLD ENRICHED  
7 ORGANOID, AGAIN IN VITRO, WE SEE THAT -- OF COURSE,  
8 WE SEE EXCITATORY NEURONS, INHIBITORY NEURONS,  
9 PRECURSOR ASTROCYTES, AND MATURE ASTROCYTES. I'LL  
10 GO INTO THAT IN A LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL.

11 BUT FROM THE FUNCTIONAL POINT OF VIEW, YOU  
12 CAN SEE THAT THEY CONTINUE TO MATURE FROM THREE  
13 MONTHS TO FIVE MONTHS. AND RESEARCH HAS ALL THE  
14 MORPHOLOGICAL EVIDENCE ACCORDING TO THE FACT THAT  
15 THEY CONTINUE TO GROW AND ELABORATE THE PROCESSES.  
16 THEY ARE FUNCTIONAL TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY CAN TAKE  
17 UP GLUTAMATE, A TRANSMITTER THAT IS NORMALLY  
18 SECRETED BY NEURONS; BUT IN THE ABSENCE OF THIS  
19 UPTAKE, GLUTAMATE CAN BE TOXIC TO NEURONS AND MAY,  
20 IN OUR ESTIMATE, BE PART OF THE REASON WHY NEURAL  
21 ORGANOID THEMSELVES HAVE THIS CERTAIN TOXICITY THAT  
22 OCCURS OVER TIME BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO TAKE  
23 AWAY THE EXCESS GLUTAMATE. THEY ALSO CAN ELICIT  
24 CALCIUM SPIKES WITH STIMULATION OF GLUTAMATE AS WELL  
25 IN VITRO. THIS IS ALL IN VITRO.

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

1 SO WE TRANSPLANTED THESE CELLS INTO OUR  
2 TRANSPLANTATION MODEL. HERE'S THE TRANSPLANT HERE.  
3 AND THEY SURVIVE VERY WELL AND THEY CO-LOCALIZE WITH  
4 THE HUMAN ANTIBODY. SO WE KNOW THEY'RE HUMAN.  
5 QUITE REMARKABLY, THIS IS THE IN VITRO ORGANOID, AND  
6 IT HAS A GREATER CONTENT OF ASTROCYTES, BUT THEY'RE  
7 REALLY DISORGANIZED. THEY'RE NOT PATTERNED AND  
8 DISTRIBUTED LIKE THEY ARE IN VIVO AND LIKE WE SEE IN  
9 THE BRAIN. THERE'S ACTUALLY A DECREASE IN VITRO,  
10 BUT THEY BEGIN TO PATTERN THEMSELVES.

11 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN  
12 HUMAN AND MOUSE ASTROCYTES, IT'S REALLY QUITE  
13 EXTRAORDINARY. NOT ONLY ARE THEY LARGER, BUT THEIR  
14 SHAPE IS REALLY QUITE DIFFERENT. THEY HAVE THESE  
15 LONG EXTENDED PROCESSES THAT ARE DIRECTLY ATTRACTED;  
16 WHEREAS, THE MOUSE ASTROCYTES FORM A SPHERICAL  
17 SHAPE. THE LONG PROCESSES THAT EXTEND FROM THE  
18 ASTROCYTES ARE OFTEN ASSOCIATED WITH BLOOD VESSELS.  
19 IN VIVO THAT'S WHAT ONE SEES AND ALSO WHAT ONE SEES  
20 IN VIVO.

21 AFTER TRANSPLANTATION NOW, WE CAN IDENTIFY  
22 NOT JUST THAT THERE'S ASTROCYTES THERE, BUT THE FULL  
23 PRINCIPAL TYPES OF ASTROCYTES THAT HAVE BEEN  
24 DESCRIBED IN HUMAN LITERATURE CAN BE RECAPITULATED  
25 IN THESE ORGANOIDS, SPECIFICALLY UPPER AND -- IT'S

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

1 CALLED THE PEEL LAYER. WE HAVE THESE INTER-LAMINAR  
2 ASTROCYTES SEND THEIR PROCESSES DOWN. THEY'RE  
3 CLASSIC SORT OF PLASMIC ASTROCYTE IN THE CORE OF THE  
4 TISSUE AND THE FIBROUS ASTROCYTES WHERE IT SITS ON  
5 THE GLIAL SITE MOVING UP INTO THE TISSUE.

6 INTERESTINGLY, THERE'S AN ASTROCYTE WHICH  
7 IS UNIQUE TO HUMANS CALLED THE VARICOSE PROJECTION  
8 ASTROCYTE, AND WE SEE THAT ONE AS WELL. THAT MISSED  
9 CELL RIGHT HERE HAS A SINGLE BLIPPY  
10 PROTOPLASMIC-LIKE THING WHICH SENDS ON A PROCESS  
11 THAT IS BEADED. AND THIS IS A UNIQUE FEATURE  
12 OF -- IS A UNIQUE ASTROCYTE ACTIVITY IN HUMANS THAT  
13 DOESN'T EXIST IN MOUSE OR LOWER SPECIES. BUT ALL  
14 THE OTHER TYPES EXIST IN THERE, AND THEY ARE  
15 LAMINATED.

16 INTERESTING FOR THOSE THAT HAVE WORKED  
17 WITH ORGANIDS IN THE PAST, ONCE THEY'RE  
18 TRANSPLANTED AND VASCULARIZED, THEY DON'T -- THEY NO  
19 LONGER HAVE A ROSETTE IN THE CORE AND, RATHER,  
20 BECOME A FULL LAYERED CORTICAL TISSUE.

21 SO ONE OF THE FEATURES OF ASTROCYTES THAT  
22 WE KNOW IS, AS I POINTED TO YOU BEFORE, THEY SEND  
23 THEIR PROCESSES AND EXPRESS A GENE CALLED APOE4  
24 ALONG THE VASCULAR BED. SO HERE IS A BLOOD VESSEL  
25 HERE STAINED FOR APOE4A, WHICH IS A PROTEIN FROM THE

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

1 ASTROCYTE. HERE THEY ARE LAMINATED. IN VITRO,  
2 OBVIOUSLY THERE'S NO BLOOD VESSELS AND IT'S JUST  
3 SORT OF DISTRIBUTED DIFFUSELY AROUND IN THE  
4 ASTROCYTE. THEY STILL MAKE IT, BUT IT'S NOT LOCATED  
5 TO THE VASCULAR SYSTEM.

6           HERE IS A 3D -- WHAT THIS IMAGE IS GOING  
7 TO SHOW YOU IS WHAT'S CALLED THE VASCULAR UNIT WHICH  
8 IS COMPRISED OF ENDOTHELIAL CELLS, PERICYTES,  
9 ASTROCYTES, AND ENDOTHELIAL CELLS, AND EXTRACELLULAR  
10 MATRIX IN TIGHT JUNCTION. AND THIS IS THE UNIT THAT  
11 KEEPS THE OUTSIDE BLOOD FROM COMING INTO THE BRAIN  
12 OR WHAT IS CALLED BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER. HERE'S A  
13 THREE-DIMENSIONAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THAT. THESE ARE  
14 EM SECTIONS. THEY'RE A SECTION THAT'S VERY THIN AND  
15 THEN STACKED, AND THEN WE CAN GO BACK AND LABEL  
16 THEM. THEY DON'T COME THIS WAY. WE HAVE TO COLOR  
17 THEM. BUT IT NOT ONLY HAS PERICYTES, MEMBRANES,  
18 TIGHT JUNCTIONS, AND ENDOTHELIAL CELLS. UNIQUE,  
19 AGAIN, TO THE HUMAN IS THE FACT THAT THE ASTROCYTE  
20 ABUTS THE UNIT AND COMPLETELY SURROUNDS IT BY ONE  
21 ASTROCYTE. IN THE MOUSE THEY GENERALLY SEND  
22 PORTIONS OF THEIR PROCESSES AND WOULD HAVE, SAY, AN  
23 ASTROCYTE HERE, AN ASTROCYTE PORTION HERE, AND MAYBE  
24 A THIRD ASTROCYTE THERE. SO THIS IS A UNIQUE FORM  
25 OF THE VASCULAR UNIT IN HUMAN RELATIVE TO THE MOUSE.

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

1           IS THE BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER INTACT? WE DID  
2 THIS BY GIVING DEXTRAN BEADS TO THE  
3 INTRAORBITAL -- INJECT THEM INTRAORBITALLY. AND YOU  
4 CAN SEE THAT THE DYE WILL -- IN THE LIVER AND THE  
5 MUSCLE IT GETS OUT AND SPREADS OUT TO ALL THE  
6 TISSUES. HOWEVER, IN THE BRAIN YOU GET NO LEAKAGE  
7 OR LITTLE LEAKAGE AND ONLY STAYS WITHIN THE BLOOD  
8 VESSELS. SO HERE'S IN OUR ADJACENT MOUSE CORTEX  
9 AFTER THE SAME EXPERIMENT, AND HERE'S WITHIN THE  
10 TRANSPLANT. SO WE SEE THAT THE BIOTIN TRACER IS  
11 EXCLUDED FROM THE TISSUE AND IS MAINTAINED IN THERE,  
12 EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE FACT THAT THIS IS A  
13 RELATIVELY INTACT BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER.

14           A CAVEAT HERE IS THAT THE ENDOTHELIAL  
15 CELLS AND THE PERICYTES THAT MAKE UP THIS  
16 BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER ARE DERIVED FROM THE MOUSE.  
17 THEY'RE MIGRATING IN FROM THE MOUSE, AND WE ARE NOT  
18 SUPPLYING AT THIS POINT THOSE CELLS. SO THIS IS A  
19 LIMITATION.

20           CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO, RUSTY, WE ARE AT  
21 ABOUT 25 MINUTES JUST TO GIVE YOU A MARK.

22           DR. GAGE: PERFECT. I'M TWO MINUTES AWAY  
23 OR THREE.

24           SO WE HAVE -- IN THE SINGLE-CELL  
25 SEQUENCING WE CAN LOOK AT THESE ASTROCYTES UNIQUELY,

1 AND WE FIND THAT GO CATEGORIES FOR THE GENES  
2 IDENTIFY THOSE THINGS THAT WE BELIEVE TO BE  
3 IMPORTANT FEATURES LIKE BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER,  
4 PERMEABILITY, POSITIVE REGULATION, VASCULAR  
5 PERMEABILITY. ALL THESE GENES ARE UPREGULATED IN  
6 THE ASTROCYTE IN THESE EMBEDDED TRANSPLANTED  
7 ORGANOID.

8 JUST A LITTLE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE  
9 MATURATION OF THEM. WE COMPARED THIS TO BEN BARRES'  
10 EARLY WORK. WE ISOLATED ASTROCYTES FROM HUMAN FETAL  
11 AND ADULT BRAIN, AND WE SEE THAT THE IN VITRO HAS A  
12 FEW OF THESE MORE ADULT GENE MARKERS, MORE OF THE  
13 FETAL; WHEREAS, IN OUR TRANSPLANT ORGANOID, THEY  
14 MATURE QUITE DRAMATICALLY OVER TIME.

15 LARRY, I'M NOT GOING TO TELL TOO MUCH, BUT  
16 ALSO PART OF THE STORY IS THAT THE ASTROCYTES EMBED  
17 INTO THESE NEURONAL ORGANOID, INDUCE A RATHER  
18 DRAMATIC MATURATION OF THE NEURONS AS WELL. SO  
19 HERE'S THE IN VITRO ORGANOID AND HERE ARE NEURAL  
20 GENE ONTOLOGY SIGNALS, INDICATING THESE NEURONS,  
21 PURIFIED NEURONS, HAVE NOW TAKEN ON A MATURE SET.  
22 AND WE CAN SEE THIS BY LOOKING AT AN ELECTRON  
23 MICROSCOPE WHERE YOU CAN NOW SEE INTACT SYNAPSES.  
24 SO THIS IS A PRESYNAPTIC TERMINAL HERE WITH VESICLES  
25 AND POSTSYNAPTIC DENSITY AND POST (UNINTELLIGIBLE),

1 WHICH ARE EVIDENT IN THESE CELLS.

2 FINALLY, WE WANT TO TEST FUNCTIONALITY.

3 SO WE STIMULATED THE ANIMALS WHO HAVE TNF-ALPHA, AN  
4 INFLAMMATORY INDUCTION MECHANISM. SO AN INCREASE IN  
5 THE SUBSET OF ASTROCYTES IN THE TYPES OF GENES AND  
6 NUMBER OF CELLS THAT TOOK PLACE. WE LOOK AT THOSE  
7 IN QUITE DETAIL, AND WE SEE THAT THERE'S AN  
8 UPREGULATION OF TWO HALLMARKS OF INFLAMMATION,  
9 INTERFERON GAMMA, TNF-ALPHA SIGNALING OR NF-KAPPA-B  
10 AS WELL, INTERESTINGLY, THE DOWNREGULATION OF OXYGEN  
11 PHOSPHORYLATION. SO THE CELLS BECOME MORE  
12 GLYCOLYTIC IN THEIR INFLAMED STATE, WHICH IS  
13 CHARACTERISTIC OF THE LITERATURE.

14 FUN NOTE IS WE CAN TAKE THIS SAME ORGANOID  
15 AND TEST THINGS IN MORE DETAIL IN VITRO. SO WE TAKE  
16 THE ASTROCYTE ORGANOID, TREAT FOR TNF-ALPHA SHORTLY  
17 AND LOOK FOR GENES THAT ARE INVOLVED. AND WHAT WE  
18 FIND IS THAT CD38, A KEY REGULATOR OF NAD+ LEVELS IN  
19 THE BRAIN INVOLVED IN INFLAMMATION AND INTERHUMAN  
20 METABOLISM, IS DRAMATICALLY UPREGULATED IN THE  
21 BRAIN. IN THE SUBSET OF ASTROCYTES, THERE ARE  
22 CANCER DRUGS OUT THERE THAT SPECIFICALLY INHIBIT  
23 CD38. WE CAN APPLY THOSE IN THIS IN VITRO MODEL AND  
24 WE CAN DRAMATICALLY RETURN NAD+, THE NAD RATIO IN  
25 THESE CELLS AFTER REDUCTION.

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

1 AND THIS ALSO IS SHOWN BY LOOKING AT THE  
2 FRAGMENTATION OF MITOCHONDRIA. AGAIN, SHOWING THAT  
3 THE REESTABLISHMENT OF METABOLIC ACTIVITY WITHIN  
4 THESE CELLS. SO WE HAVE RAPIDLY DERIVED FUNCTIONAL  
5 ASTROCYTES, BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER, AND FUNCTIONALITY  
6 OF THE GLIAL CELLS.

7 ONE LAST THING, A COUPLE OF SLIDES JUST TO  
8 SHOW THE DIRECTION WE ARE GOING. I TOLD YOU THAT  
9 THE ENDOTHELIAL CELLS WERE NOT OF HUMAN ORIGIN. WE  
10 HAVE APPLIED THIS PROTOCOL, WHICH IS CALLED  
11 "GENERATION OF BLOOD VESSEL ORGANOIDS FROM HUMAN  
12 PLURIPOTENT CELLS" BY JOSEF PENNINGER. AND WE  
13 APPLIED THIS, AND WE CAN NOW SORT OUT HUMAN  
14 PERICYTES AND ENDOTHELIAL CELLS. IT'S QUITE  
15 REMARKABLE. THIS IS WHAT THESE ENDOTHELIAL  
16 ORGANOIDS LOOK LIKE, AND THEY HAVE PDGF. THEY HAVE  
17 ALL THE MARKERS FOR THE CELLS THAT WE WANT.

18 WE'VE DEVELOPED A PROTOCOL NOW WHERE WE  
19 CAN EMBED THE ENDOTHELIAL ORGANOID WITH OUR EXISTING  
20 ASTROCYTE AND MICROGLIA ORGANOID, AND WE CAN NOW FOR  
21 THE FIRST TIME SEE HUMAN VASCULARIZATION BEGINNING  
22 IN THESE HUMAN ORGANOIDS. AND WE'VE JUST BEGUN TO  
23 TRANSPLANT THESE CELLS TODAY SO THAT WE CAN SEE IF  
24 THE HUMAN ENDOTHELIAL CELL AND PERICYTES WILL  
25 ANASTOMOSE WITH THE MOUSE VASCULATURE SO WE CAN GET

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

1 A MORE COMPLETE HUMAN BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER.

2 THIS IS THE SUMMARY THAT I STARTED OFF  
3 WITH. WE HAVE MICROGLIA AND ASTROCYTES. WE ARE ON  
4 THE WAY TO ENDOTHELIAL AND PERICYTES. WE HAVE A  
5 STRATEGY FOR OLIGODENDROCYTES THAT I'M HAPPY TO  
6 SHARE. AND WE'VE BEGUN DOING THE COMPARISON  
7 EXPERIMENTS BY INDUCTING WITH PUTTING THE HEALTHY  
8 MICROGLIA INTO A DISEASED ENVIRONMENT TO ASK  
9 DIRECTIONALITY. AND WE ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO  
10 DEVELOPING THESE MODELS THAT WILL BE USEFUL FOR  
11 ADDRESSING HUMAN BRAIN DISEASES HERETOFORE UNTAPPED.

12 SO WITH THAT, I WANT TO THANK TWO  
13 EXTRAORDINARY POST DOCS IN THE LAB, ONE FOR THE  
14 ASTROCYTES AND ONE FOR THE MICROGLIA. AND THEY TEAM  
15 UP TO WORK ON PUTTING THESE TOGETHER NOW INTO A  
16 COMMON SYSTEM.

17 I'LL STOP THERE, LARRY, AND ESCAPE FROM  
18 THIS. AND SHOULD I STOP SHARING? UNLESS YOU WANT  
19 TO LOOK AT PICTURES AGAIN.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WELL, ACTUALLY, YEAH.  
21 WHY DON'T YOU GO AHEAD AND KEEP CONTROL BECAUSE IT  
22 COULD BE THAT A QUESTION WILL ELICIT THE NEED FOR A  
23 PARTICULAR SLIDE.

24 DR. GAGE: OKAY.

25 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO THAT'S TERRIFIC,

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

1 RUSTY. THIS SYSTEM ALREADY LOOKS LIKE IT'S GOING TO  
2 BE INCREDIBLY VALUABLE COMPARED TO PREVIOUS 2D AND  
3 NEURAL ONLY SYSTEMS.

4 ONE QUICK QUESTION. AS THESE BECOME -- AS  
5 THESE ORGANIDS BECOME BETTER VASCULARIZED, WHAT DO  
6 YOU THINK IS GOING TO LIMIT THEIR SIZE WHEN  
7 TRANSPLANTED INTO THE MOUSE BRAIN?

8 DR. GAGE: SO WE'VE BEEN DOING THIS NOW  
9 FOR ABOUT FIVE YEARS. AND WE DO NOT -- THEY STOP  
10 DIVIDING. SO YOU DON'T HAVE -- THEY MATURE ENOUGH.  
11 BECAUSE THEY'RE MATURING SO MUCH, THEY DON'T HAVE  
12 ANY DIVIDING CELLS. WE PULSE WITH VRDU. AND YOU  
13 WILL SEE AN OCCASIONAL DIVIDING CELL, BUT I THINK  
14 IT'S A REPLACEMENT RATHER THAN ANY OTHER CELL. THEY  
15 REALLY ARE RESTRAINED BY THE CAVITY SIZE.

16 I THINK THAT'S THE SAME QUESTION YOU WOULD  
17 ASK OF YOURSELF, WHY YOUR BRAIN ISN'T BURSTING OUT  
18 OF YOUR SKULL, IS THAT IT REACHES A RESTRICTIVE  
19 LIMIT.

20 THERE ARE ABOUT, I WOULD SAY, 3  
21 MILLIMETERS WHEN THEY ARE GRAFTED, AND THEY GET UP  
22 TO ABOUT 3.5 TO 4 MILLIMETERS AND THEN THEY STOP AT  
23 THAT POINT.

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: PRETTY REASONABLE  
25 SIZE.

1 PAT.

2 DR. LEVITT: THAT'S GREAT, RUSTY. AMAZING  
3 TECHNOLOGY. SO TWO RELATED QUESTIONS. ONE IS THE  
4 AMOUNT OF WORK IN THESE EXPERIMENTS THAT YOU  
5 DESCRIBED IS GINORMOUS. THAT'S LIKE BEYOND  
6 ENORMOUS, RIGHT, IS GINORMOUS.

7 SO FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF TRYING TO  
8 UNDERSTAND BOTH MECHANISM AND ALSO PEOPLE HAVE  
9 WRITTEN -- THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF WRITING ABOUT THE  
10 USE OF ORGANOIDS AND STEM CELLS FOR TARGETING DRUG  
11 SCREENING. WHAT IS YOUR VIEW ON THAT BECAUSE WHAT  
12 YOU'VE DESCRIBED IS CERTAINLY TIME-CONSUMING,  
13 GNAWING OUT ITS BENEFITS?

14 AND THEN THE OTHER THING THAT'S RELATED TO  
15 THAT IS LIKE IN YOUR BIOLOGICAL PSYCHIATRY PAPER  
16 THAT YOU WROTE WITH PAOLA, YOU DID AN INTRODUCTION  
17 TO THE SPECIAL ISSUE. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT PAOLA  
18 HAS EMPHASIZED IS THE HETEROGENEITY, WHICH I THINK  
19 IS BIOLOGICAL. RIGHT? AND SO HOW ARE YOU THINKING  
20 ABOUT THAT IN TERMS OF THE NUMBERS THAT YOU'D NEED  
21 TO GET TO A POINT WHERE YOU FEEL THE SCREENINGS  
22 WOULD ACTUALLY BE VALID AND VALUABLE?

23 DR. GAGE: I THINK --

24 DR. LEVITT: TWO VERY EASY QUESTIONS FOR  
25 YOU.

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

1 DR. GAGE: YEAH. WELL, FOR ONE, WE DO --  
2 IN A SETTING, IN ONE DAY WE CAN DO 25 TO 30 ANIMALS.  
3 SO WE CAN GET GOOD SIZED GROUPS THAT WAY. WE  
4 USUALLY DO -- SUBJECT-WISE, WE'LL DO THEM IN  
5 DUPLICATE OR TRIPLICATE. THESE ARE ALL REPS. THIS  
6 IS ALL THE GRAPHICS. AT THAT POINT, UNLIKE WITH  
7 TISSUE CULTURE, YOU DON'T FEED YOURSELVES. YOU JUST  
8 PUT THEM IN A CAGE AND THEY FEED THEMSELVES.

9 DR. LEVITT: SURE.

10 DR. GAGE: SO I DO THINK THAT THIS IS A  
11 MORE COMPLICATED MODEL, BUT -- AND WHAT I WAS TRYING  
12 TO SHOW HERE WITH THE IN VITRO EVIDENCE, WE INJECTED  
13 TNF-ALPHA AND GOT AN INFLAMMATORY RESPONSE. AND WE  
14 COULD THEN PURSUE THAT IN THE SUBPOPULATION IN VITRO  
15 FOR THE SHORT-TERM PERIOD THAT WE WANTED. SO I  
16 THINK WE ARE NOT SAYING THAT YOU WANT TO THROW OUT  
17 ALL IN VITRO WORK; BUT, RATHER, YOU CAN GET A MORE  
18 AUTHENTIC REPRESENTATION OF THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN  
19 CELLS IN THE IN VIVO SETTING. AND JUST LIKE WE HAVE  
20 DONE IN THE PAST WITH MICE WHERE YOU DO SOME OF THE  
21 WORK IN MICE; BUT THEN ONCE YOU ACTUALLY GET TOWARDS  
22 THE MECHANISM, THEN YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE IT INTO  
23 SIMPLER, MORE IN VITRO SYSTEM SO YOU CAN DO  
24 MECHANISTIC KINDS OF THINGS OR HIGH THROUGHPUT  
25 SCREENING. THIS IS NOT WHERE YOU WOULD DO HIGH

1 THROUGHPUT SCREENING. THIS IS WHERE YOU WOULD  
2 DISCOVER MECHANISMS AND THEN COME BACK LATER AND  
3 MAKE SURE THAT THE COMPOUNDS THAT YOU FOUND THAT ARE  
4 DOING THEIR THING DO IT IN THIS CONTEXT AS WELL.

5 SO I DON'T WANT TO REPRESENT THAT I'M  
6 PROMOTING THIS OVER AND ABOVE, BUT AS AN ADDED TOOL  
7 TO THE ARSENAL.

8 DR. LEVITT: OKAY. AND WHAT ABOUT THE  
9 HETEROGENEITY ISSUE WHICH --

10 DR. GAGE: I GUESS I'M -- THERE IS  
11 INDIVIDUAL HETEROGENEITY, AND WE EMBRACE  
12 HETEROGENEITY AS INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES. WE, OF  
13 COURSE, ARE INTERESTED IN THAT WITH REGARD TO MOBILE  
14 ELEMENTS AND WAYS IN WHICH DIVERSITY CAN BE  
15 GENERATED WITH THE TOOLS. WE HAVE FOUND THAT  
16 BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS, SO SAME ORGANIDS TRANSPLANTED  
17 IN TWO SEPARATE MICE BUT FROM THE SAME PATIENT, ARE  
18 SIMILAR TO EACH OTHER. SO THEY CLUSTER BY SUBJECT  
19 RATHER THAN JUST RANDOM VARIATION. SO IT'S NOT  
20 RANDOM VARIATION. I BELIEVE, AS YOU SAID, IT'S  
21 INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES, AND WE EMBRACE THOSE  
22 DIFFERENCES.

23 AND, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THIS AUTISM STUDY  
24 THAT WE'VE DONE WITH THE MACROCEPHALIA, THEY ARE  
25 CLEARLY DIFFERENT. THEY HAVE -- THE ORGANIDS GROW

1 BIGGER, THEY GROW FASTER, AND THEY HAVE MORE  
2 PROLIFERATING CELLS IN THEM RELIABLY ABOVE THE  
3 AGE-MATCH CONTROL.

4 SO WHILE WORKING WITH HUMANS ALWAYS ADDS  
5 EXTRA VARIANCE INTO THE SETTING, I BELIEVE THE MORE  
6 YOU CAN CONSTRAIN THE CONTEXT IN WHICH YOU'RE  
7 GROWING THEM AND ALSO THAT YOU'RE PROVIDING  
8 APPROPRIATE NUTRIMENTS, YOU CAN REDUCE THAT AMOUNT  
9 OF HETEROGENEITY.

10 TO BE HONEST WITH YOU, I THINK THAT PART  
11 OF THE HETEROGENEITY IS THIS NECROSIS THAT OCCURS IN  
12 THE CORE OF THE ORGANOID THAT LEADS TO VARIABLE  
13 RESPONSE WITHIN THE HOST. AND EACH ORGANOID IS  
14 GOING TO BE SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT DEPENDING UPON HOW  
15 MUCH NECROSIS THERE REALLY IS. I THINK SOME OTHERS  
16 HAVE ALSO COME TO RECOGNIZE THIS AND THEY'RE SEEING  
17 THAT THIS INCREASE IN STRESS RESPONSE IN THE CORE IS  
18 IMPACTING THE REST OF THOSE CELLS. I THINK  
19 VARIABILITY, I DON'T WANT TO SAY ALL OF IT, BUT I  
20 WOULD SAY SOME OF IT COMES FROM THE --

21 YOU KNOW, THE OTHER THING, JUST TO PLAY ON  
22 THAT, YOU CAN GET ASTROCYTES, HUMAN ASTROCYTES, IN  
23 THESE ORGANIDS, BUT IT TAKES ABOUT FIVE MONTHS, AND  
24 THEN THEY'RE ONLY IN THE OUTER PORTIONS. AND THAT'S  
25 A VARIABLE POINT BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT ALWAYS THERE.

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

1 SO I WOULD ARGUE THAT, LIKE ALL OF US, WE WANT TO  
2 HAVE AS MUCH CONTROL OF OUR ENVIRONMENT. THAT'S WHY  
3 WE WANT TO DRIVE THE ASTROCYTES AND TAKE OUR TIME.  
4 WE WANT TO EMBED THE MICROGLIA AND TAKE THE TIME.  
5 WE WANT TO BRING THE ENDOTHELIAL CELLS AND TRY TO  
6 MIMIC THE TIME PERIOD WHEN THEY ACTUALLY WOULD GET  
7 IN THERE AS BEST WE CAN.

8 LOT OF WORDS. LOT OF WORDS.

9 DR. LEVITT: THAT WAS GREAT. THANK YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: QUESTIONS FROM THE  
11 GROUP?

12 RUSTY, THE PROGRESS YOU GUYS HAVE MADE,  
13 I'M SURE IT'S BEEN AGONIZING AT TIMES, BUT CERTAINLY  
14 FROM THE OUTSIDE, OH, IT LOOKS EASY. AND IT WAS  
15 REALLY FAST AND YOU KNEW ALL ALONG EXACTLY WHAT YOU  
16 ARE GOING TO DO, BUT IT'S A BEAUTIFUL SYSTEM. AND I  
17 THINK ALL OF US LOOK FORWARD TO FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS  
18 FOR FIGURING OUT WHAT'S GOING WRONG IN ALL THE  
19 VARIOUS DISORDERS WE ARE TRYING TO FIGHT, ALS AND  
20 ALZHEIMER'S AND THE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS.  
21 HAVING A SYSTEM THAT RELIABLY RECAPITULATES  
22 FUNCTION -- WHOOPS, THERE'S FRED -- IS GOING TO BE  
23 INCREDIBLY USEFUL. SO FRED.

24 DR. FISHER: THAT'S THE FIRST TIME I'VE  
25 HEARD, WHOOPS, THERE'S FRED. HI, RUSTY. IT'S

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

1 BEEN --

2 DR. GAGE: HI.

3 DR. FISHER: -- A VERY LONG TIME.

4 SO WHEN YOU WERE DESCRIBING YOUR MODEL AND  
5 ITS SEPARATION FROM A VASCULAR SYSTEM, I'M  
6 INTERESTED OF WHETHER YOU'VE LOOKED AT CLIVE  
7 SVENDSEN'S WORK WHO'S DONE A LOT OF WORK IN THIS  
8 AREA ALSO. THEY'VE NOW CREATED SORT OF WHAT THEY  
9 CALL BRAIN ON A CHIP WHERE THEY HAVE THE VASCULAR  
10 SYSTEM, THEY HAVE THE NEURONS AND THE ASTROCYTES AND  
11 ALL OF THAT, AND THEY CAN WATCH THE INTERACTION.  
12 I'M WONDERING HOW THAT WORK INFORMS THE FUTURE OF  
13 WHAT YOU'RE DOING.

14 DR. GAGE: I HAVE BEEN FOLLOWING IT. AND  
15 WE HAVE A SEPARATE EFFORT USING, IT'S NOT A CHIP,  
16 BUT IT'S A FABRICATED, MICROFABRICATED TOOL. WE ARE  
17 WORKING WITH THE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT. AND WE CAN  
18 GET -- WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO IS YOU HAVE TO FLOW -- WE  
19 MAKE OUR VASCULAR ORGANIDS AND THEY WILL PENETRATE  
20 INTO THE ORGAN. THEIR SURVIVAL LENGTH AND DURATION  
21 IS LIMITED, AND YOU'RE RELYING ON PROVIDING  
22 ARTIFICIAL CSF AND BLOOD VESSELS THROUGH. THE  
23 BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER IS NOT SO STURDY IN THOSE CASES  
24 WHERE YOU CAN SORT OF TEST ORGANIDS, BUT I'M  
25 HOPEFUL THAT THAT TECHNOLOGY WILL COME ALONG AND

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

1 MOVE ALONG AND COMPLEMENT THE TRANSPLANTATION WORK  
2 AS WELL.

3 I WOULD SAY, THOUGH, THAT IRONICALLY THIS  
4 MODEL IS GOING TO BE DEPENDENT ON WHERE YOU PUT IT  
5 AND HOW OLD THE ANIMALS ARE WHEN YOU DO THE  
6 TRANSPLANTATION. THIS IS NOT ADDRESSING YOUR POINT  
7 EXACTLY, FRED, BUT I HOPE I ADDRESSED IT. I DON'T  
8 FEEL LIKE ANY OF US ARE IN COMPETITION. I FEEL LIKE  
9 WE ARE ALL STRIVING TOWARDS IT. AND IF YOU CAN GET  
10 AN IN VITRO SYSTEM WHERE IT ACTUALLY HAS AN IMPACT  
11 ON THE BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER WITH PERICYTES AND THEY  
12 PENETRATE AND THEY ARE HUMAN AND THEY FULFILL THE  
13 OBLIGATORY NUTRIMENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO KEEP  
14 THEM ALIVE FOR EXTENDED PERIODS OF TIME AND MATURE  
15 THE NEURONS, THEN THAT'S GREAT. I THINK THAT WILL  
16 BE A GOOD COMPLEMENT TO WHAT'S GOING ON.

17 ONE INTERESTING THING IS THAT THIS MODEL  
18 THAT I PRESENTED TO YOU WAS ACTUALLY DEVELOPED -- I  
19 DEVELOPED THIS IN 1984 WHEN I WAS IN SWEDEN. AND WE  
20 WERE TRYING TO FIND LOCATIONS IN THE BRAIN WHERE WE  
21 COULD TRANSPLANT SUPERIOR CERVICAL GANGLION TO TEST  
22 WHETHER OR NOT ANY DIFFERENT AREAS IN THE BRAIN HAD  
23 NERVE GROWTH FACTOR, HUMAN NERVE GROWTH. THIS WAS A  
24 LONG AGO. SO WE IMPLANTED IT INTO THIS COLLICULUS,  
25 WHICH IS (UNINTELLIGIBLE) ACTUALLY, BUT WE TRIED

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

1 LOTS OF DIFFERENT AREAS. AND THERE ARE VERY FEW  
2 PORTS IN THE AREA WHERE THEY SURVIVE FOR EXTENDED  
3 PERIOD OF TIME AND ARE HIGHLY VASCULARIZED WITHIN  
4 THE TISSUE. WE ARE STILL EXPLORING OTHER AREAS, BUT  
5 I THINK THAT'S AN ISSUE THAT HAS TO BE CONSIDERED.

6 THE OTHER ISSUE IS THE AGE OF THE  
7 ORGANISM. IF WE TRANSPLANT EARLY ON DURING EARLY  
8 DEVELOPMENT, THEN THE ORGANIDS TEND TO GROW MUCH  
9 LARGER. AND WE'VE CHOSEN TO GRAFT INTO THE ADULT SO  
10 IT RESTRICTS THE AMOUNT OF GROWTH THAT THE ORGANOID  
11 WILL GO THROUGH. BUT REMEMBER, IN THE DEVELOPING  
12 BRAIN, THE BRAIN IS GROWING AT THE SAME TIME. AND  
13 ONE OF THE FACTORS THAT ARE INVOLVED IN INDUCING ITS  
14 OWN CELLS TO GROW ARE IMPACTING ON THE HOST AS WELL.

15 ANOTHER -- IT'S NOT MORE QUESTIONS.  
16 ANOTHER INTERESTING FACT IS THAT IF WE DON'T PUT  
17 ASTROCYTES AND MICROGLIA IN THE ORGANOID, THEN THE  
18 HOST MICROGLIA AND ASTROCYTES WILL MIGRATE IN. BUT  
19 IF YOU PUT HUMAN MICROGLIA INTO THE ORGANOID, IT  
20 PREVENTS, YOU WILL SEE THE MICROGLIA ON THE BRAIN  
21 SIDE -- ON THE MOUSE SIDE, BUT NONE OF THEM CO-STAIN  
22 WITH HUMAN MARKERS. AND THAT'S TRUE FOR ASTROCYTES.  
23 THERE IS AN INTERESTING EVOLUTIONARY BARRIER FOR  
24 ASTROCYTES AND MICROGLIA THAT WILL NOT PENETRATE  
25 INTO THE HUMAN TISSUE IF THE OBLIGATORY OR THEIR

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

1 SISTER CELLS ARE PRESENT.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. FINAL  
3 QUESTION. ABLA.

4 DR. CREASEY: THANK YOU, DR. GOLDSTEIN.  
5 AGAIN, THANK YOU, DR. GAGE. VERY NICE PRESENTATION.

6 I WANTED TO KNOW JUST PHILOSOPHICALLY THIS  
7 BEAUTIFUL SYSTEM, CAN IT BE USED FOR THE STUDY OF  
8 BIOLOGY AND THE PATHOGENESIS OF DISEASES OF THE  
9 BRAIN? OR IS IT MAINLY A SCREENING METHODOLOGY FOR  
10 POTENTIALLY IDENTIFYING AGENTS THAT AFFECT EACH OF  
11 THE CELL TYPES?

12 DR. GAGE: I WANT TO MAKE SURE I  
13 UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION.

14 DR. CREASEY: IF WE ARE INTERESTED IN THE  
15 BIOLOGY OF UNDERSTANDING MECHANISM OF DISEASE OF THE  
16 BRAIN --

17 DR. GAGE: YES.

18 DR. CREASEY: -- IS THIS -- DO YOU THINK  
19 THIS WILL BE A GOOD SYSTEM TO DO THAT?

20 DR. GAGE: YES. WELL, SO WE'VE SHOWN, FOR  
21 EXAMPLE, THAT -- I'LL GIVE YOU TWO EXAMPLES. IN  
22 VITRO IN MONOLAYS WE'VE SHOWN THAT BIPOLAR CELLS,  
23 HIPPOCAMPAL BIPOLAR NEURONS FROM PATIENTS WITH  
24 BIPOLAR DISEASE, THAT ARE NONRESPONSIVE TO LITHIUM  
25 TEND TO BE HYPEREXCITABLE IN A MONOLAYER SETTING.

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

1 BUT WE ARE RESTRICTED IN TERMS OF HOW MUCH  
2 MECHANISTICALLY WE CAN UNDERSTAND THAT. AND WHILE  
3 WE DO SEE THIS HYPEREXCITABILITY IN THE ORGANOID  
4 SETTING AND WE WANT TO UNDERSTAND WHETHER OR NOT WE  
5 CAN USE THIS AS A TOOL TO GET A BETTER UNDERSTANDING  
6 OF THAT HYPEREXCITABILITY THAT YOU SEE IN THE  
7 LITHIUM NONRESPONDING PATIENTS.

8 SO WE CERTAINLY BELIEVE THAT THE ORGANOIDS  
9 WILL BE A VEHICLE FOR UNDERSTANDING PATHOPHYSIOLOGY  
10 OF DISEASE, AND THAT'S OUR MAIN GOAL IN DOING THIS.  
11 WE ALSO HAVE ANOTHER STUDY IN DEPRESSION WHERE WE  
12 FIND THAT PATIENTS THAT ARE RESPONSIVE TO ISSCR'S  
13 HAVE A DIFFERENT PROFILE THAN THOSE THAT DO RESPOND  
14 TO ISSCR'S. AND, AGAIN, TRYING TO NAIL DOWN THE  
15 MECHANISM FOR HOW THAT PATHOPHYSIOLOGY IS  
16 MANIFESTED. SO WE BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A GOOD MODEL  
17 FOR TRACKING THAT DOWN.

18 DR. CREASEY: THANK YOU. I WAS MAINLY  
19 THINKING ABOUT LIKE WHAT ARE THE TRIGGERS FOR THE  
20 PATHOGENESIS OF DISEASE AND HOW THE DISEASE  
21 PROGRESSES. BUT IT APPEARS THAT EVENTUALLY YOU HAVE  
22 ALL THE CELL TYPES THAT YOU NEED IN ORDER TO ANSWER  
23 THAT KIND OF QUESTIONS IN THAT ORGANOID. IS THAT  
24 RIGHT?

25 DR. GAGE: YEAH. I WAS REALLY HOPING THAT

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

1 THAT ONE EXAMPLE I SHOWED YOU WHERE YOU TAKE THE  
2 NEUROTYPICAL MICROGLIA AND PUT IT INTO A DISEASE  
3 ORGANOID AND SHOW THAT IT IS THE HOST THAT'S  
4 ACTIVATING THOSE MICROGLIA SUGGESTS THAT THE  
5 PATHOGENIC SIGNAL TO GET AN INFLAMED BRAIN IS COMING  
6 FROM THE HOST. AND WE ARE LOOKING INTO WHAT  
7 FEATURES IN THE HOST, RATHER THAN CONCENTRATING ON  
8 THE MICROGLIA, WHAT IS THE HOST DOING TO ACTIVATE  
9 AND AGGRAVATE THESE MICROGLIA.

10 DR. CREASEY: GREAT. THANK YOU.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. THANK YOU VERY  
12 MUCH, RUSTY. THAT WAS REALLY EDIFYING, EXCITING,  
13 AND I THINK IT'S GOING TO MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE  
14 MOVING FORWARD IN THE COMING YEARS TO HAVE MODELS  
15 LIKE THIS AND OTHERS THAT ARE BEING DEVELOPED. SO  
16 THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

17 AND WE ARE AT A TRANSITION POINT. RUSTY,  
18 YOU'RE WELCOME TO STAY AS LONG AS YOU WANT, BUT OUR  
19 NEXT --

20 DR. GAGE: WOULD YOU RATHER THAT I LEAVE?

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: NO. IT'S TOTALLY UP  
22 TO YOU.

23 DR. GAGE: I'VE GOT EIGHT MINUTES FOR MY  
24 NEXT MEETING. SO I COULD HANG ON.

25 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD.

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

1 DR. GAGE: I ALSO THANK YOU ALL FOR  
2 INVITING ME AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE TO THE  
3 COMMITTEE AND TO THE COMMUNITY FOR SERVING ON THIS  
4 BOARD.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YOU GOT IT.

6 SO NEXT UP IS VICE PRESIDENT ROSA  
7 CANET-AVILES WHO WILL PRESENT A PROPOSED CONCEPT  
8 PLAN THAT, IF WE SIGN OFF ON IT, WILL THEN MOVE TO  
9 THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND THEN, IF IT GOES WELL  
10 THERE, ON TO THE FULL BOARD. SO, ROSA, PLEASE TAKE  
11 IT AWAY.

12 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, DR.  
13 GOLDSTEIN. AND THIS PRESENTATION FROM DR. GAGE WAS  
14 VERY ON POINT WITH WHAT I'M GOING TO PRESENT. I  
15 THINK IT WAS FURTHERING THE EVIDENCE OF THE UTILITY  
16 OF HUMAN STEM CELL MODELS IN MODELING THE PATHOLOGY  
17 OF NEURO DISEASES, ESPECIALLY THE IMPORTANCE OF THE  
18 NEUROIMMUNE AXIS, FOR EXAMPLE. SO WE WILL HEAR  
19 ABOUT THIS IN A FEW MINUTES AS I GO ALONG.

20 SO THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY THAT WE HAVE TO  
21 PRESENT THE FIRST PHASE OF THE CIRM NEUROSCIENCE  
22 STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION. AND IT WILL COME IN  
23 THE FORM OF THE NEURO DISCOVERY CONCEPT, ALSO KNOWN  
24 AS REMIND. AND REMIND STANDS FOR RESEARCH USING  
25 MULTIDISCIPLINARY INNOVATIVE APPROACHES IN

1 NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES.

2 WHAT I WILL BE PRESENTING TODAY IS  
3 ACTUALLY A CONCEPT THAT WILL START WITH A PILOT.  
4 AND THIS IS -- WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS A PHASED  
5 APPROACH THAT I WILL BE EXPLAINING IN LATER SLIDES.  
6 AND WE ARE GOING TO PILOT THIS AS A POTENTIAL  
7 FRAMEWORK FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY DISCOVERY RESEARCH  
8 AT CIRM WITH A GROWING INVESTMENT ADAPTING TO CIRM'S  
9 GROWTH IN OTHER PARTS OF THIS INFRASTRUCTURE. SO I  
10 WANT TO CLARIFY THAT THIS IS NOT ONLY FOR, AS YOU  
11 WILL SEE LATER, NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES. IT'S  
12 ABOUT DISEASE MECHANISM RESEARCH, AND WE ARE GOING  
13 TO PILOT THIS WITH NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES OR  
14 THAT'S WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING. BUT IF THE MODEL OF  
15 THIS INITIATIVE IS SUCCESSFUL, WE WILL BE GROWING  
16 INTO OTHER DISEASES. I WANTED TO MAKE THIS CLEAR SO  
17 THAT THERE IS NO CONFUSION. SO LET'S GET STARTED.

18 THIS IS -- CIRM'S NEUROSCIENCE STRATEGY  
19 HAS BEEN DEVELOPED IN THE CONTEXT OF OUR MISSION  
20 STATEMENT. AND IT MAPS OUT AND INTEGRATES WITH THE  
21 ELEMENTS OF OUR MISSION AND STRATEGIC PLAN AND  
22 SPECIFICALLY WITH THE FIRST THEME OF OUR STRATEGY,  
23 ADVANCING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE AND THE TWO MAIN  
24 GOALS, WHICH IS DEVELOP COMPETENCY HUBS AND BUILDING  
25 A KNOWLEDGE INFRASTRUCTURE OR THE KNOWLEDGE

1 NETWORKS.

2 THE REMIND INITIATIVE CORRESPONDS TO THE  
3 DISCOVERY PHASE OF CIRM NEURO STRATEGY. AND THE  
4 TRAN AND THE CLIN WILL BE ADDRESSED SEPARATELY. I  
5 ALSO WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE PROVIDE THE RIGHT  
6 CONTEXT FOR TODAY'S DISCUSSION.

7 THIS IS ALL A REMINDER THAT THIS COMES  
8 FROM WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF PROP 14'S MANDATE AND  
9 CIRM'S \$1.5 BILLION SET ASIDE FOR MENTAL HEALTH  
10 RESEARCH WITH THE POTENTIAL TO TRANSFORM THE  
11 TREATMENT FOR DISEASES AND CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN  
12 AND THE CNS.

13 THE GOAL OF THIS SLIDE IS TO PROVIDE A  
14 FRAME FOR THE BACKGROUND AND THE RATIONALE FOR THE  
15 CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE CURRENT CONCEPT AND THE  
16 VISION OF THE NEURO DISCOVERY STRATEGY HAS BEEN  
17 INFORMED BY MULTIPLE LAYERS, AS YOU CAN SEE HERE, OF  
18 STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSION AND INPUT THAT STARTED EVEN  
19 PRIOR TO THE PASSAGE OF PROP 14 OVER THE PAST TWO  
20 YEARS AND IS OUTLINED IN THIS TIMELINE CHART.

21 AND THERE ARE THREE MAJOR TAKEAWAYS, KEY  
22 TAKEAWAYS. ONE IS THAT THERE ARE MAJOR GAPS IN OUR  
23 UNDERSTANDING OF MECHANISMS UNDERLYING DISEASE  
24 PROCESSES IN THE BRAIN. FOR EXAMPLE, WE KNOW A LOT  
25 ABOUT HOW THE HEART WORKS, WHICH HAS BEEN KEY

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

1 ACTUALLY FOR DEVELOPING THERAPIES. BUT THE BRAIN IS  
2 FAR MORE COMPLICATED, AS WE'VE JUST SEEN WITH DR.  
3 GAGE'S PRESENTATION, AND WE KNOW VERY LITTLE. SO  
4 THAT HAS BEEN IMPEDING THE PROGRESS IN FINDING  
5 THERAPIES FOR PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. AND THE  
6 KEY TAKEAWAY IS THAT THE LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF  
7 THESE UNDERLYING MECHANISMS OF DISEASE PROCESSES IN  
8 THE BRAIN IS A MAJOR BOTTLENECK IN THE DEVELOPMENT  
9 OF SUCCESSFUL THERAPIES.

10 NOW, IN ORDER TO DISCOVER THESE  
11 MECHANISMS, ONE OF THE BEST WAYS IS TO LEVERAGE  
12 COLLABORATION. SO THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND PRODUCTIVE  
13 WAY THAT WE HEARD WAS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A  
14 CONSORTIUM APPROACH WHERE GENOMICS AND BIG DATA,  
15 NOVEL STEM CELL MODELS, PATIENT DATA COULD BE  
16 COLLECTIVELY LEVERAGED TO ADVANCE THE FIELD OF NEURO  
17 RESEARCH IN A COLLABORATIVE MANNER.

18 IN ORDER FOR A CONSORTIUM TO HAVE ITS  
19 MAXIMUM OUTPUT, WE NEED TO PROMOTE KNOWLEDGE SHARING  
20 AND EXPAND SHAREABLE RESOURCES TO ACCELERATE  
21 RESEARCH OF COMPLEX DISEASES.

22 SO WHAT HAS CIRM DONE TO COVER THIS LACK  
23 OF MECHANISTIC NEURO UNDERSTANDING SINCE ITS  
24 INCEPTION? FOR THAT, WE NEEDED A GAP ANALYSIS OF  
25 THE PORTFOLIO. AND IN THE PAST NEURO TASK FORCES,

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

1 WE PROVIDED THIS PORTFOLIO GAP ANALYSIS. AT THE  
2 LAST TASK FORCE MEETING, WE PRESENTED AN INTERNAL  
3 PORTFOLIO GAP ANALYSIS. THIS SLIDE SUMMARIZES THE  
4 HISTORICAL FUNDING FOR DISCOVERY, WHICH WAS UP UNTIL  
5 NOW \$1.2 BILLION. THE NEURO FUNDED DISCOVERY, 28  
6 PERCENT. AND OF THOSE 28 PERCENT, THERE WAS 4  
7 PERCENT IN NEURO DISEASE MECHANISMS. NOW, THAT  
8 WASN'T A LOT -- SIGNIFICANT. WHERE DID THE OTHER 24  
9 PERCENT GO? WELL, IT WENT PARTLY TO FUND SCIENTIFIC  
10 PROGRESS, REFINING DIFFERENTIATION PROTOCOLS, AND  
11 CREATING MORE COMPLEX MODELS IN A DISH, SUCH AS  
12 ORGANOIDs, AS WE HEARD, SO THAT THE FIELD COULD BE  
13 READY TO STUDY DISEASE MECHANISMS.

14 SO CIRM INVESTED IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND  
15 THE BASIC, BASIC FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH OF THIS TO  
16 MAKE THE FIELD READY TO STUDY WITH THE MODELS. AND  
17 THAT'S KIND OF WHERE WE ARE NOW.

18 SO WHAT IS THE FOCUS THAT WE ARE GOING TO  
19 HAVE? THE FOCUS THAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS GENERATION  
20 OF NOVEL THERAPIES FOR NEURO DISEASES WHICH REQUIRES  
21 UNCOVERING THE UNDERLYING MECHANISMS. THEREFORE,  
22 THE FIRST GOAL OF CIRM'S NEURO DISCOVERY STRATEGY,  
23 WHICH CORRESPONDS TO THE GOAL OF THE CONCEPT FOR THE  
24 PROGRAM THAT WE ARE PROPOSING, COULD BE TO  
25 ACCELERATE THE DISCOVERY OF MECHANISMS UNDERLYING

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

1 CNS DISORDERS LEADING TO THE IDENTIFICATION AND  
2 VALIDATION OF NOVEL TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS WITH THE  
3 GOAL THAT THESE EFFORTS WOULD PROVIDE NEW AVENUES  
4 AND RIGOROUS FOUNDATIONS FOR OTHER TRANSLATIONAL AND  
5 CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT WORK.

6 AS YOU CAN SEE, I MENTIONED HERE NEURO.  
7 IT'S NOT NEUROPSYCHIATRIC. WHAT THE GOAL IS IS  
8 THE -- REMIND IS A CONCEPT FOR A LARGE INITIATIVE  
9 THAT COULD BE PHASED. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ITS  
10 FIRST INSTALLMENT WE ARE GOING TO PROPOSE TO BE  
11 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, BUT IT'S NOT GOING TO BE ALL.

12 SO HOW ARE WE GOING TO GO ABOUT THIS?  
13 WHAT ARE THE SPECIFICS OF HOW WE WILL GO ABOUT  
14 ACHIEVING THIS GOAL? THE OBJECTIVES PROPOSED FOR  
15 THIS INITIAL PROGRAM ARE TO FIRST ADVANCE  
16 FOUNDATIONAL SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING OF  
17 NEUROLOGICAL AND DISEASE MECHANISMS. AND THE GOAL  
18 IS THAT THESE EFFORTS WILL ULTIMATELY PROVIDE NEW  
19 AVENUES AND RIGOROUS FOUNDATIONS FOR OTHER  
20 TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT WORK.

21 THE SECOND COULD BE TO CATALYZE  
22 MULTIDISCIPLINARY INNOVATION AND ATTRACT NEW TALENT  
23 AND IDEAS INTO THE STUDY OF NEURO DISEASES.

24 WE NEED TO INCENTIVIZE AND CATALYZE AN  
25 OPEN, COLLABORATIVE SCIENCE ECOSYSTEM AND SUPPORT

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

1 THESE KIND OF INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATIVE  
2 THEMES, EMPOWERING THE NEXT GENERATION OF  
3 SCIENTISTS, AND BRINGING TOGETHER OUTSTANDING,  
4 INNOVATIVE, FORWARD-THINKING SCIENTISTS FROM  
5 DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES INTO A COLLABORATIVE NETWORK.

6 ULTIMATELY MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAMS WITH  
7 BIG DATA, COMPUTATIONAL ANALYSIS, FOCUSED DISCOVERY  
8 WORK CAN LEAD TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF NOVEL TARGETS  
9 AND BIOMARKERS WITH IMMEDIATE IMPLICATIONS FOR  
10 CLINICAL TRIALS. AND THIS GOES HAND IN HAND WITH  
11 INCENTIVIZING AN OPEN, COLLABORATIVE SCIENTIFIC  
12 SYSTEM THROUGH DATA AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING  
13 INFRASTRUCTURES.

14 NOW, ANOTHER OBJECTIVE DERIVED FROM THIS  
15 COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT IS TO MOTIVATE AND SUPPORT  
16 INNOVATIVE AND BOLD AND INFORMATIVE NEW IDEAS AND  
17 TOOLS THAT ADDRESS FUNDAMENTAL CHALLENGES IN CNS  
18 DISEASE BIOLOGY. A VERY GOOD EXAMPLE OF THIS WAS,  
19 FOR EXAMPLE, OPTOGENETICS. IF WE CAN INVESTIGATE  
20 HOW THE NEURONS WORK TOGETHER BY USING LIGHT TO TURN  
21 SOME NEURONS ON AND RECORD THE RESPONSE OF OTHER  
22 NEURONS, WE'VE ADVANCED A LOT THE FIELD. SO IF WE  
23 HAD INVESTED IN THIS AT CIRM, THAT COULD HAVE MADE A  
24 BIG TRANSFORMATION FUNDED BY CIRM.

25 SO THE LAST ONE IS TO LEVERAGE AND CONNECT

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

1 WITH CIRM'S EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE OF PROGRAMS.  
2 AND WE WILL SEE THIS AS WE SHOW HOW EVERYTHING MAPS  
3 TOGETHER WITHIN OUR ECOSYSTEM OF CIRM-FUNDED  
4 PROGRAMS, BUT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THE SHARED  
5 RESOURCE LABS, THE COMPETENCY HUBS, INFRASTRUCTURE  
6 PLATFORMS LIKE THE DATA COORDINATING AND MANAGEMENT  
7 CENTER THAT WILL BE -- WE ARE CONCEPTUALIZING IT  
8 RIGHT NOW AND OTHERS.

9 SO WHAT ARE THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT CIRM  
10 CAN LEVERAGE TO PUT THIS GOAL IN PLACE? THE FIRST  
11 ONE, AS WE MENTIONED, IS THE \$1.5 BILLION. AND IT'S  
12 NOT ALL THAT COULD GO TO JUST THE NEURO DISCOVERY,  
13 OBVIOUSLY, BUT PART OF PROP 14'S \$1.5 BILLION  
14 EARMARKING SET-ASIDE FOR RESEARCH IN MENTAL HEALTH  
15 AND CNS DISEASES. AND THE SECOND COULD BE THE  
16 SCIENTIFIC STRENGTH, INNOVATION, AND EXPERTISE IN  
17 GENETICS AND STEM CELL BIOLOGY, AND NEUROSCIENCE IN  
18 CALIFORNIA. WE HAVE A DEEP POOL OF CALIFORNIA STEM  
19 CELL RESEARCHERS, INCLUDING CIRM-SUPPORTED TRAINEES  
20 AND INVESTIGATORS.

21 THE WORLD-CLASS CALIFORNIA STEM CELL  
22 RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING CIRM-FUNDED  
23 SHARED RESOURCE LABS, THE IPSC BIOBANK, THE PLANNED  
24 DATA INFRASTRUCTURE, AND OTHERS. ALSO LARGE AMOUNT  
25 OF DATA AND RESOURCES FROM OTHER NEURO-FOCUSED

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

1 CONSORTIA INITIATIVES. AND ADVANCES IN STEM CELL  
2 TECHNOLOGIES TO STUDY THE ENTIRE DIVERSITY OF  
3 CALIFORNIANS WITH DISEASES OF THE BRAIN. AND AS YOU  
4 WILL SEE, SOME OF THOSE ADVANCES HAVE BEEN POINTED  
5 OUT BY THE TASK FORCE MEETINGS.

6 NOW, IN ORDER FOR THE COLLABORATIVE  
7 RESEARCH TO HAVE AN IMPACT AND ACCELERATE OUR  
8 UNDERSTANDING OF THESE DISEASES, THE SCOPE OF THE  
9 FIRST INITIATIVE SHOULD BE FOCUSED. THERE ARE MANY  
10 NEURO DISEASES WITH A MULTITUDE OF MECHANISMS. AND  
11 THESE MECHANISTIC WORLDS DO INTEGRATE, BUT WE NEED  
12 TO START FROM THE BOTTOM WITH A FOCUS. AND IN ORDER  
13 TO DO THAT, THE BOARD REQUESTED THAT WE DO ANOTHER  
14 GAP ANALYSIS. AND WE FOUND THAT WHEN WE MAPPED THE  
15 DISCOVERY RESEARCH FROM CIRM'S INCEPTION BY DISEASE  
16 TO THE DISEASE BURDEN IN THE U.S. AT THE TIME, WE  
17 FOUND THAT NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES HAD NOT BEEN  
18 FUNDED BY CIRM. SO BASICALLY NEUROPSYCHIATRIC  
19 DISEASES WERE HISTORICALLY UNDERFUNDED AT CIRM  
20 DESPITE THE LARGE BURDEN AND UNMET NEED.

21 SO WE PROPOSE THAT THIS COULD BE A GOOD  
22 PLACE TO START. THEREFORE, THE NEURO TASK FORCE  
23 STARTED WITH A SERIES OF MEETINGS THAT MADE THE CASE  
24 THAT THE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC SPACE WAS PRIME FOR RAPID  
25 PROGRESS DUE TO SEVERAL RECENT ADVANCEMENTS.

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

1           ONE WAS THE GENETIC RISK ARCHITECTURE WAS  
2           STARTING TO BEING DEFINED. IT IS STILL FAR FROM THE  
3           AGNOSTIC OR PREDICTIVE, BUT WE ARE GETTING CLOSER.  
4           AND WE ARE GETTING BETTER AT TRANSLATING LOCI TO  
5           GENES TO PATHWAYS.

6           THE SECOND POINT THAT WE HEARD ABOUT WAS  
7           THE DEMONSTRATED UTILITY OF HUMAN STEM CELL MODELS.  
8           AND WE HEARD A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THIS TODAY.  
9           BASICALLY MOUSE MODELS HAVE REVEALED COMPLEX  
10          INTERACTION OF GENES AND CIRCUITS AND BEHAVIOR, BUT  
11          THEY HAVE SEVERE LIMITATIONS. FOR EXAMPLE, THEY  
12          CAPTURE POORLY THE IMPACT OF NONCODING VARIANTS.  
13          AND WE'VE LEARNED FROM KRISTIN BRENNAND'S  
14          PRESENTATION THAT IT'S NOT IDEAL.

15          THERE'S ALSO THE ADVANCEMENT IN RELATED  
16          RESEARCH TECHNOLOGIES. WHAT CAN THEY TEACH US ABOUT  
17          PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS? AND WITH ALL THIS EVIDENCE  
18          THAT WE HEARD, THE FOCUS OF THE FIRST IMPLEMENTATION  
19          FOR THIS CONCEPT WE PROPOSE TO BE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC  
20          DISEASE MECHANISMS.

21          SO HOW DID WE PROPOSE THE STRUCTURE OF  
22          THESE RFA PROGRAMS TO FUND ACCELERATION OF DISCOVERY  
23          OF DISEASE MECHANISMS IN NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS  
24          AS THE FIRST PHASE OF THIS PILOT PROGRAM?

25          SO FOR THIS WE ARE PROPOSING TWO TYPES OF

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

1 AWARDS. A FIRST TYPE OF AWARD, THE LARGE  
2 COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH PROJECTS, COULD REQUIRE DATA,  
3 PRELIMINARY DATA. IT COULD BE A FOUR-YEAR AWARD  
4 WITH A BASE COMPONENT OF \$2 MILLION PER YEAR WITH \$8  
5 MILLION IN TOTAL OVER THE FOUR YEARS. WE WOULD  
6 EXPECT A NUMBER OF SIX AWARDS TO BE FUNDED WITH A  
7 TOTAL BUDGET PER CYCLE WHICH WE'LL SEE NOW AND ABOUT  
8 FIVE OR MORE INVESTIGATORS, MINIMUM OF FIVE  
9 INVESTIGATORS.

10 NOW, WE THOUGHT THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO  
11 INCENTIVIZE COLLABORATION. AND TO DO THAT, WE  
12 DECIDED THAT IF WE COULD -- IF THE TEAMS BRING  
13 MATCHING FUNDS OF A MINIMUM OF \$.5 MILLION A YEAR,  
14 THIS CAN BE FROM INDUSTRY, FROM OUTSIDE  
15 COLLABORATORS, FROM OTHER CONSORTIA, AND IT DOES NOT  
16 NEED TO BE FROM OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA. IT CAN BE  
17 FROM INSIDE OF CALIFORNIA. SO A GROUP COULD BE  
18 COLLABORATING WITH A COMPANY. SO IF YOU BRING \$.5  
19 MILLION A YEAR IN FUNDING, CIRM WILL MATCH THOSE  
20 FUNDS WITH A TOTAL OF 2 MILLION IN TOTAL FOR THE  
21 FOUR YEARS.

22 SO THIS LED TO A TOTAL FOR THIS TYPE OF  
23 PROGRAM OF \$2.5 MILLION A YEAR, WHICH COULD BE THREE  
24 WITH THE MATCHING, \$10 MILLION IN DIRECT FUNDS COST  
25 PER AWARD FOR A TOTAL OF FOUR YEARS AND A TOTAL OF

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

1 \$72 MILLION WITH INDIRECT COSTS AS THE TOTAL THAT WE  
2 HAD ASKED FOR THIS PROGRAM.

3 THE SECOND TYPE OF AWARDS COULD BE MORE  
4 EXPLORATORY PROJECTS, MORE PROOF OF CONCEPT OR  
5 INITIAL VALIDATION OF THE PROPOSED TOOL, MODEL,  
6 HYPOTHESIS. THIS COULD GO WITH THE INNOVATIVE PART  
7 OF THE OBJECTIVES. THIS COULD BE WITHOUT REQUIRED  
8 PRELIMINARY DATA, TWO YEARS, AND \$.5 MILLION A YEAR  
9 WITH A MILLION DOLLAR TOTAL FOR THE AWARD, 15  
10 EXPECTED NUMBER OF AWARDS, \$18 MILLION IN TOTAL.  
11 AND THIS COULD BE TWO OR MORE INVESTIGATORS MINIMUM.

12 NOW, HOW DO WE SEE THIS FLOWING THROUGH TO  
13 THE TIMELINE? SO REMIND-L COULD BE FOUR YEARS. THE  
14 LARGE COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS COULD GO -- AND THEN  
15 THERE WOULD BE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ONE MORE TIME  
16 RENEWAL FOR FOUR MORE YEARS IN THE NEXT CYCLE. AND  
17 IN CASES WHERE THINGS HAVE ADVANCED THAT CAN BE  
18 LEVERAGED BY A TRAN OR CLIN, THERE WOULD BE THE  
19 POSSIBILITY OF DYNAMISM TO THIS MECHANISM THAT WE  
20 WILL EXPLAIN THROUGH DISCOVERY ADVISORY PANELS. SO,  
21 FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU ARE IN YEAR TWO AND YOU HAVE A  
22 DISCOVERY ADVISORY PANEL, YOU'VE ALREADY SHOWN  
23 VALIDATION OF A NEW TARGET, YOU COULD ACTUALLY MOVE  
24 TOWARD A TRANSLATIONAL AWARD OR APPLICATION OF CIRM  
25 FUNDS.

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

1           AND THEN REMIND-X COULD START IN YEAR TWO.  
2           SO WE WOULD HAVE AN RFA STARTING -- POSTING NEXT  
3           YEAR IN '24, AND THEN IN '25 WE COULD HAVE REMIND-X  
4           STARTING AGAIN.

5           NOW, THIS IS A PILOT. AGAIN, WHAT I  
6           WANTED TO SHOW WITH THIS SLIDE IS THAT WE ARE  
7           PILOTING A NEW FRAMEWORK. AND THESE AWARDS THAT WE  
8           WOULD HAVE, THE EXPLORATORY WITH THE LARGER  
9           COLLABORATIVE LARGER AWARDS, AND THEN ALL  
10          INTEROPERATING WITH THE DISCOVERY PROGRAMS, ALL OF  
11          THESE COULD BE REPEATED. WE WOULD HAVE ANOTHER --  
12          AND I'M NOT SAYING THAT WE ARE GOING TO FUND  
13          SPECIFICALLY THIS. THESE ARE ONLY EXAMPLES. BUT  
14          THEN WE COULD HAVE ANOTHER ONE IN FOUR YEARS TIME  
15          THAT COULD THEN START WITH NEUROVASCULAR AND  
16          NEUROIMMUNE AXIS TYPE OF FOCUS OF DISEASE  
17          MECHANISMS, OTHER NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES, OTHER FOCUS  
18          AREAS OR BOTTLENECKS. WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO SHOW  
19          HERE IS THAT WE ARE TRYING TO PILOT A FRAMEWORK FOR  
20          A WAY OF FUNDING DISCOVERY RESEARCH IN NEUROLOGICAL  
21          DISEASES.

22  
23  
24  
25

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

1           THIS PROGRAM, AS I WAS SHOWING, WE ARE  
2           PROPOSING A PHASED APPROACH THAT WILL ALLOW MORE  
3           CONTINUITY AND EXPANSION TO OTHER AREAS OF CNS  
4           RESEARCH, PILOTING THIS POTENTIAL FRAMEWORK FOR  
5           MULTIDISCIPLINARY DISCOVERY RESEARCH AT CIRM AND  
6           GROWING AN INVESTMENT, ADAPTING TO CIRM'S GROWTH AND  
7           ITS INFRASTRUCTURE KNOWLEDGE NETWORK AND COMPETENCY  
8           HUB CAPABILITY.

9           AGAIN, THIS IS NOT ONLY FOR  
10          NEUROPSYCHIATRIC. NEUROPSYCHIATRIC WOULD START THIS  
11          YEAR WHERE WE ARE PROPOSING \$72 MILLION AND SIX  
12          TEAMS AND THEN 15 TEAMS AND \$18 MILLION FOR THE  
13          INNOVATION. BUT THEN IT COULD -- AS WE MOVE TO THE  
14          NEXT ROUND, WE COULD STILL INCLUDE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC,  
15          BUT THEN WE WOULD FUND OTHER DISEASES. THESE ARE  
16          EXAMPLES ONLY. AND WE COULD ALLOCATE MORE FUNDING  
17          AS THE INFRASTRUCTURE WOULD ALREADY BE SETTLED AND  
18          IT WOULD ALREADY BE INTEROPERATING WITH THE DATA  
19          COORDINATING MANAGEMENT CENTER AND OTHER PARTS OF  
20          CIRM'S INFRASTRUCTURE. AND WE WOULD HAVE ALREADY  
21          LEARNED HOW TO DO IT WITH OTHER CONSORTIA, AND WE  
22          WOULD BE ABLE TO FUND EVEN MORE, AND WE WOULD BE  
23          GROWING, AND WE WOULD BE ABLE TO FIGURE OUT COMMON  
24          MECHANISMS AMONGST THESE DISEASES AS WELL. AND THEN  
25          AS WE GROW EVEN FURTHER, WE COULD BE FUNDING MORE.

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

1 THE NEXT SLIDE -- OH, ACTUALLY I FORGOT TO  
2 MAKE A POINT HERE. IN HERE YOU CAN SEE THAT THIS  
3 PHASED APPROACH COULD BE ALSO COORDINATED, THE  
4 PROGRAMS COULD BE COORDINATED ADDING A DISCOVERY  
5 ADVISORY PANEL. THE DISCOVERY ADVISORY PANEL COULD  
6 BE PROVIDING INPUT TO THE RESEARCHERS, TO THE  
7 AWARDEES. SO THIS IS A PART OF THE PROGRAM THAT  
8 CIRM COULD PUT IN PLACE. SAME AS WE HAVE  
9 TRANSLATIONAL ADVISORY PANELS AND CLINICAL ADVISORY  
10 PANELS, WE PROPOSE TO HAVE A DISCOVERY ADVISORY  
11 PANEL THAT IS SOME EXPERTS THAT WILL PROVIDE INPUT  
12 SO THAT WE CAN LEARN AS WE MOVE FORWARD AND HELP THE  
13 AWARDEES LEVERAGE EACH OTHER'S RESEARCH AND IN SOME  
14 INSTANCES, IF THINGS ARE ADVANCING FASTER, TO HELP  
15 THEM MOVE FASTER TOWARDS TRANSLATION OR CLINICAL.  
16 WE COULD ALSO HAVE AN ANNUAL NETWORK CONFERENCE, AND  
17 ALL OF THIS DATA COULD BE WORKING AND INTEROPERATING  
18 WITH THE DATA COORDINATING AND MANAGEMENT CENTER.

19 AGAIN, THIS SLIDE IS THE ONE THAT SHOWS  
20 HOW THIS PROGRAM BUDGET COULD BE GROWING AS WE ARE  
21 GROWING THE PROGRAM AND AS NEW DISEASES ARE COMING  
22 INTO PLACE IN THIS INITIATIVE.

23 AND THEN THIS SLIDE ALSO INTENDS TO SHOW  
24 WHAT THE ESTIMATED PROJECTIONS OF MONEY SPENDING  
25 COULD BE FOR THIS PROGRAM. SO THE CNS PROJECTS --

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

1 THIS IS FOR THE REMIND. SO IT COULD BE \$72 MILLION.  
2 THEN IF WE MAKE 12 TEAMS, IN FOUR YEARS TIME, 144,  
3 12 MORE TEAMS, \$144 MILLION. WE COULD KEEP ABOUT  
4 THE SAME LEVEL IN THE REMIND-X. BUT THEN WE ALSO  
5 NEED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT CNS PROJECTS THAT ARE  
6 PART OF OUR DISC-0 AND 2 PILLAR PROGRAMS CURRENTLY,  
7 AS WE ARE MAKING CHANGES, CONCEPT AMENDMENTS, WE ARE  
8 GOING TO BE INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF FUNDING TO  
9 THESE PILLAR PROGRAMS. AND THIS IS AN ESTIMATE  
10 BECAUSE THIS HAS NOT YET BEEN PRESENTED OR APPROVED  
11 BY THE BOARD.

12 BUT IMAGINING THAT WE END UP FUNDING AT  
13 THE LEVEL THAT WE BELIEVE MIGHT BE FUNDING, THIS  
14 COULD CORRESPOND TO ABOUT \$235 MILLION IN THE NEXT  
15 12 YEARS, WHICH MEANS THAT THE TOTAL DISCOVERY NEURO  
16 FUNDING APPROXIMATELY COULD BE ABOUT \$648 MILLION OF  
17 THE 1.5 BILLION THAT ARE EARMARKED. SO THIS IS JUST  
18 A ROUGH APPROXIMATE.

19 AGAIN, THIS IS A PRESENTATION OF AN  
20 OVERALL CONCEPT FOR A NEW INITIATIVE, NEW WAY OF  
21 FUNDING NEURO DISCOVERY SCIENCE AT CIRM.

22 AGAIN, A REMINDER OF THE KEY PROGRAM  
23 DRIVES. THE REMIND PROGRAM DRIVES KEY OBJECTIVES TO  
24 ACCELERATE FOUNDATIONAL SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING OF  
25 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, BUT IN GENERAL NEURO DISEASE

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

1 MECHANISMS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF NOVEL TOOLS.  
2 CATALYZING MULTIDISCIPLINARY INNOVATION. YOU'VE  
3 SEEN THIS STRUCTURE THAT WE ARE PROPOSING FOR THESE  
4 LARGE TEAMS. ATTRACTING NEW TALENT AND IDEAS INTO  
5 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC RESEARCH AND SEEDING NEW  
6 PARTNERSHIPS.

7 JUST AS LITTLE BIT OF INFORMATION, WE ARE  
8 ALREADY, WE'VE BEEN TALKING TO DIFFERENT PARTNERS,  
9 ESPECIALLY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ARE FUNDING, BUT  
10 ALSO OTHER PARTNERS SO THAT WE CAN LEVERAGE ALL OF  
11 THESE TOGETHER, THEIR INVESTMENT AS WELL INTO THIS  
12 INITIATIVE.

13 AND THEN DRIVING OPEN AND COLLABORATIVE  
14 SCIENCE AND ALIGNING BEST PRACTICES THROUGH DATA AND  
15 KNOWLEDGE SHARING INFRASTRUCTURE, WHICH IS SOMETHING  
16 THAT WE ARE WORKING VERY HARD AND THAT WE WILL BE  
17 PROVIDING A CONCEPT. SO THIS COULD BE IMPLEMENTED  
18 RIGHT AFTER WE INITIATE. AND WE ARE TAKING INTO  
19 ACCOUNT HOW WE COULD MAKE IT WORK GIVEN THAT THE  
20 DATA COORDINATING AND MANAGEMENT CENTER COULD HAPPEN  
21 RIGHT AFTER.

22 THIS COULD ALL BE COORDINATED THROUGH THE  
23 DATA COORDINATING AND MANAGEMENT CENTER STEERING  
24 COMMITTEE. AND, AGAIN, THIS IS JUST A PRESENTATION  
25 OF WHAT THIS MODEL IS TAKING INTO ACCOUNT IN TERMS

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

1 OF PROGRAM FOR LARGE RESEARCH TEAMS, PROJECTS, AND  
2 THE CIRM DISCOVERY PILLAR PROJECTS.

3 CHECKING WITH TIME, LARRY, AM I DOING  
4 WELL? WE HAVE A FEW MORE SLIDES, ABOUT FIVE MORE  
5 SLIDES.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THAT'S FINE. GOT TO  
7 LEAVE SOME TIME FOR DISCUSSION THOUGH.

8 DR. CANET-AVILES: WONDERFUL. YES, ABOUT  
9 HALF AN HOUR.

10 SO THE REMIND HIGH-LEVEL OUTCOMES COULD BE  
11 THE NOVEL MECHANISTIC INSIGHTS. SO REMIND-L, WHICH  
12 IS THE LARGE COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM, WOULD LEAD TO  
13 NOVEL MECHANISTIC INSIGHTS INTO THE BIOLOGY OF  
14 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES, COULD ALLOW US TO GET  
15 FURTHER UNDERSTANDING OF CURRENT MECHANISMS,  
16 INCLUDING MECHANISMS CUTTING ACROSS CLASSICALLY  
17 DEFINED DISEASE BOUNDARIES. AS YOU CAN SEE, AS WE  
18 ADD MORE DISEASES, WE WILL HAVE A CHANCE TO FIND  
19 THOSE COMMON MECHANISMS EVEN MORE, BUT WE NEED TO  
20 START WITH SOMETHING DEFINED. AND EXTENSION OF  
21 VALIDATION OF FINDINGS TO DIVERSE HUMAN POPULATIONS,  
22 AS WELL AS IDENTIFICATION AND VALIDATION OF NEW  
23 THERAPEUTIC TARGETS OR BIOMARKERS.

24 AND THEN REMIND-X, HIGH-LEVEL OUTCOMES  
25 COULD BE TO PROVIDE PROOF OF CONCEPT OR INITIAL

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

1 VALIDATION OF PROPOSED TOOLS, MODELS, OR HYPOTHESIS.

2 SO THIS IS A MODEL OF HOW WE SEE IT ALL  
3 WORKING. ULTIMATELY THIS IS A MULTIDIMENSIONAL AND  
4 LAYERED PROPOSAL THAT PULLS DIFFERENT COMPONENTS  
5 TOGETHER IN SERVICE OF THE OVERALL NEURO STRATEGY  
6 AND CONSISTENT WITH THE FEEDBACK THAT WE'VE RECEIVED  
7 FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND THE TASK FORCE  
8 OVER THE PAST FEW MONTHS.

9 THE GOAL IS TO ACCELERATE THE PACE OF  
10 DISCOVERY AND INFORM NEW PATHS TO CURE NEURO  
11 DISEASES, LEVERAGING ALREADY EXISTING  
12 INFRASTRUCTURE. AS YOU CAN SEE HERE, THERE'S THE  
13 DISCOVERY, THE SHARED LABS INFRASTRUCTURE, EVEN THE  
14 TRAINING/EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE, THEN ALSO  
15 LEVERAGING EXTERNAL CONSORTIA, RESOURCE NETWORKS AND  
16 DATA PLATFORMS, AND ULTIMATELY LEADING TO THIS OPEN  
17 SCIENCE COMMUNITY ECOSYSTEM THAT WILL LEAD TO  
18 DISCOVERY OF NOVEL TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS AND  
19 INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY AND SUCCESS OF CLINICAL  
20 TRIALS. THAT'S WHERE WE ARE ALL TRYING TO LEAD TO.

21 NOW, IN TERMS OF PROJECT ELIGIBILITY, TO  
22 BE ELIGIBLE, REMIND PROJECTS MUST PROPOSE STUDIES  
23 THAT ARE FOCUSED ON ELUCIDATION OF MECHANISMS OF  
24 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES. THAT'S FOR THE FIRST  
25 INSTALLMENT OF THIS PROGRAM AGAIN. SO THIS COULD BE

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

1 THE CONCEPT THAT WE WOULD COME IN SEPTEMBER WITH.  
2 THAT COULD BE THE RFA; BUT AS WE MOVE IN FOUR YEARS  
3 TIME, WE COULD BE ADDING OTHER DISEASES. AND  
4 INCLUDE THE STUDIES USING HUMAN STEM CELLS OR  
5 GENETIC RESEARCH.

6 NOTE THAT ANY STUDIES USING NONHUMAN  
7 SYSTEMS MUST BE VALIDATED WITH A RELEVANT HUMAN CELL  
8 EQUIVALENT.

9 IN TERMS OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR  
10 ELIGIBILITY, FOR BOTH TYPES, ALL PRINCIPAL  
11 INVESTIGATORS SHOULD BE EMPLOYED AT CALIFORNIA  
12 NONPROFIT OR FOR-PROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTION. THERE  
13 HAS TO BE ONE PI THAT'S GOING TO BE DESIGNATED AS  
14 THE COORDINATING PI WHO WILL MANAGE THE  
15 COLLABORATION AND WILL BE THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTACT  
16 FOR CIRM AND ANY GRANT PARTNERS. THE MINIMUM  
17 PERCENT EFFORT FOR THE COORDINATING PI IN THE  
18 REMIND-L, THE LARGE COLLABORATIVE, IS 20 PERCENT.  
19 AND FOR THE REMIND-X, WHICH IS THE EXPLORATORY,  
20 HIGH-RISK PROJECTS, IS GOING TO BE 10 PERCENT.  
21 OTHER PI'S WE ARE ASKING FOR A 10-PERCENT MINIMUM.

22 THE TEAM SIZE, FIVE MINIMUM FOR REMIND-L  
23 AND REMIND-X IS TWO MINIMUM. AND FOR REMIND-L WE  
24 ARE ASKING THAT AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF THE  
25 COLLABORATION SHOULD HAVE RELEVANT CLINICAL

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

1 EXPERTISE, AND ONE MEMBER SHOULD HAVE RELEVANT  
2 COMPUTATIONAL BIOLOGY EXPERTISE GIVEN THE NEED TO  
3 LINK TO CLINICAL AND ALSO TO BE ABLE TO LEVERAGE THE  
4 DATA. CIRM WILL ENCOURAGE FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION  
5 OF APPLICATIONS THAT INCLUDE AT LEAST ONE TO TWO  
6 EARLY CAREER FACULTY.

7 FOR THE REMIND-X WE STRONGLY ENCOURAGE  
8 APPLICATIONS FROM INVESTIGATORS WHO CAN BRING NEW  
9 TECHNOLOGY, RESOURCES, OR FRAMEWORKS TO THE STUDY OF  
10 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE AND IN VITRO MODELING OF  
11 CNS.

12 NOW, IN TERMS OF DATA SHARING, ALL  
13 PROPOSALS WILL NEED TO INCLUDE THE DATA SHARING AND  
14 MANAGEMENT PLAN AND DESCRIBE AN APPROACH TO SHARING  
15 AND MANAGEMENT OF DATA GENERATED CONSISTENT WITH  
16 FAIR PRINCIPLES, FINDABLE, ACCESSIBLE,  
17 INTEROPERABLE, AND REPRODUCIBLE PRINCIPLES, AND IT  
18 ALSO MUST COORDINATE WITH THE DATA COORDINATING AND  
19 MANAGEMENT CENTER THAT WILL BE PRESENTED THE CONCEPT  
20 IN MARCH OF 2024.

21 NOW, HERE THERE IS A TIMELINE SITUATION  
22 BECAUSE THE DCMC IS COMING LATER. BUT GIVEN THAT  
23 THIS RFA, IF APPROVED THE CONCEPT, THE APPLICATIONS  
24 COULD BE REVIEWED IN MAY OF 2024. WE WILL BE  
25 CREATING A PROCESS BY WHICH CIRM WILL MEET WITH THE

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

1 AWARDEES DURING THE FUNDING ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TO  
2 MAKE SURE THAT THEIR DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT  
3 WILL ALIGN WITH WHAT WE NEED FOR THE DATA  
4 COORDINATING AND MANAGEMENT CENTER. SO WE'VE BEEN  
5 THINKING ABOUT HOW THIS COULD BE DOING, AND THIS IS  
6 BRINGING ALSO ADVICE THAT WE GATHERED FROM  
7 COLLEAGUES FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THAT ARE  
8 DOING SIMILAR INITIATIVES.

9 AND THEN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION,  
10 THE APPLICATIONS NEED TO INCLUDE PLANS TO ADDRESS  
11 DEI.

12 THE DISCOVERY ADVISORY PANEL, CIRM, THIS  
13 IS VERY IMPORTANT, WILL COORDINATE THE DISCOVERY  
14 ADVISORY PANEL THAT WILL BE COMPOSED OF  
15 NON-CALIFORNIA EXPERTS TO PROVIDE INDEPENDENT,  
16 CONFIDENTIAL, EXPERT ADVICE ON REMIND PROGRAMS.  
17 THIS IS WHAT I WAS TRYING TO SAY EARLIER, BUT THIS  
18 IS A BIT BETTER ARTICULATED.

19 THE SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES OF THIS COMMITTEE  
20 COULD INCLUDE REVIEW OF THE PROGRESS REPORTED BY  
21 THESE LARGE COLLABORATIVE TEAM AWARDEES AND PROVIDE  
22 NONBINDING ADVICE TO THE AWARDEES AND CIRM. SO  
23 BASICALLY WE WILL PROVIDE THIS AS AN EXTRA RESOURCE  
24 FOR OUR APPLICANTS. AND THIS FROM OUR COLLEAGUE,  
25 ABLA CREASEY, SHE HAS TOLD US THAT THESE ARE AN

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

1 EXTREMELY HELPFUL RESOURCE FOR THE TRANSLATIONAL AND  
2 CLINICAL RESEARCHERS. AND THAT ALSO WILL HELP US  
3 IDENTIFY AND LEVERAGE EXTERNAL RESOURCES TO FURTHER  
4 COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH.

5 NOW, THE BUDGET. SO THE OVERALL CONCEPT,  
6 WE ARE NOT ASKING FOR MONEY HERE. THIS IS JUST AN  
7 ESTIMATE OF WHAT WE COULD BE INVESTING ON THE FIRST  
8 PHASE. WE ARE ONLY GIVING A PROJECTION OF THE FUNDS  
9 THAT WILL BE REQUIRED BECAUSE THE BUDGET FOR EACH  
10 ONE OF THESE RFA'S IS BEING ASKED SEPARATELY AT THE  
11 CORRESPONDING JOINT ICOC. SO THE BUDGET FOR THE  
12 REMIND-L WAS INCLUDED IN THE DISCOVERY BUDGET FOR  
13 FISCAL YEAR 23/24 THAT WAS PRESENTED BY OUR  
14 COLLEAGUE, POUNEH SIMPSON, AT THE LAST JUNE MEETING.

15 SO WHAT WE ARE ASKING IS THE REQUEST OF  
16 THE BOARD TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED REMIND PROGRAM  
17 CONCEPT AS AN INITIATIVE THAT WILL HELP US FURTHER  
18 THE DISCOVERY OF DISEASE MECHANISMS IN NEURO  
19 DISEASES AND WE WILL BE IMPLEMENTING IN ITS FIRST  
20 PHASE WITH NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES AS A FOCUS.  
21 THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, ROSA.  
23 THAT WAS A TERRIFIC PRESENTATION.

24 SO QUESTIONS AND/OR DISCUSSION FROM THE  
25 TASK FORCE? STEVE.

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

1 MR. JUELSGAARD: WONDERFUL PRESENTATION,  
2 ROSA. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. CAN YOU GO BACK TO  
3 SLIDE 15 PLEASE?

4 DR. CANET-AVILES: YES. GIVE ME A SEC.  
5 THERE YOU GO.

6 MR. JUELSGAARD: NO, IT'S THE NEXT ONE OR  
7 THE ONE BEFORE IT. IT'S THE ONE THAT SHOWS THE USE  
8 OVER TIME OF EXPANDING THE PROGRAM. SO I COUNTED --

9 DR. CANET-AVILES: YES. THIS ONE,  
10 CORRECT?

11 MR. JUELSGAARD: RIGHT. SO THIS IS MORE  
12 OF A QUESTION, I GUESS, GLOBALLY AND MAYBE FOR MARIA  
13 MILLAN. BUT THIS SUGGESTS THAT WE COULD BE FUNDING  
14 THESE PROGRAMS ON THROUGH 2035. AND WE HAVE THIS  
15 NEURO BUDGET OF 1.5 BILLION WHICH LEAVES THEN, WHAT,  
16 4 MILLION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THINGS THAT CIRM  
17 DOES.

18 DO WE HAVE A TIMELINE PLAN FOR THE  
19 EXISTENCE OF CIRM OUTSIDE OF THE CNS AREA? IN OTHER  
20 WORDS, IS CIRM GOING TO BE AROUND IN -- AS BEFORE,  
21 WHEN WE WERE THINKING ABOUT WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN  
22 WITH PROPOSITION 14 AND IT WAS A VERY CLOSE CALL, WE  
23 HAD TO HAVE A PLAN OF WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF WE DIDN'T  
24 GET REFUNDED. AND I THINK THAT'S ALWAYS WISE TO  
25 KEEP IN THE BACK OF OUR MIND, THAT THE THIRD TIME

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

1 MAY NOT BE THE CHARM.

2 AND SO THE INTEGRATION OF SPENDING \$1.5  
3 BILLION IN THE CNS AREA AND THE EXISTENCE OF CIRM  
4 WRIT LARGE SPENDING MONEY OTHERWISE, I DON'T KNOW,  
5 IS THAT BEING THOUGHT OF AS WE GO ALONG SO THAT  
6 WE'RE GOING TO KEEP CIRM GOING INDEPENDENT OR IN  
7 CONJUNCTION WITH THE CNS AREA ON UP INTO 2032, 2035?

8 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR THAT  
9 QUESTION, STEVE. SO POUNEH SIMPSON AND THE TEAM  
10 HAVE BEEN, SINCE THE PASSAGE OF PROP 14, HAVE BEEN  
11 DEPLOYING A FORECASTING TOOL IN TERMS OF  
12 EXPENDITURES OVER TIME, BOTH FOR THE RESEARCH AND  
13 ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET. THERE ARE A VARIETY OF  
14 DIFFERENT MODELS TO THAT, BUT LET'S SAY THE BASE  
15 CASE IS AN EXPENDITURE OF WHAT THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE  
16 FUNDING IS ACCORDING TO PROP 14 -- THERE ARE SOME  
17 EXCEPTIONS TO THAT -- AND THEN ALSO CALCULATING INTO  
18 IT RETURNED FUNDS, ET CETERA.

19 AND SO THE TIMELINE THAT ROSA PRESENTED IS  
20 COMPATIBLE WITH THE PROJECTION IN TERMS OF THE  
21 ADMINISTRATIVE RUNWAY ACCORDING TO THIS MODELING AS  
22 WELL AS THE RESEARCH RUNWAY WITH THOSE FUNDS. SO  
23 THERE'S KIND OF THESE PARALLEL TYPE OF FORECASTING.  
24 THIS FORECASTING TOOL IS FED BY WHAT OUR ACTUALS  
25 ARE, OUR ACTUAL PERFORMANCE IS. SO IT'S A PRETTY --

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

1 THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT ARE BUILT IN ARE BUILT IN WITH  
2 A VERY AGGRESSIVE EXPENDITURE OF THE ACTUAL BUDGETS  
3 WE BUDGET PER YEAR. AND AS YOU KNOW, THERE'S  
4 VARIANCE. SO SHE HAS A BUNCH OF DIFFERENT MODELS.

5 SO I HOPE THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTION. SO  
6 IT IS -- THE TIMELINES THAT ROSA PRESENTED ARE  
7 REASONABLE TO THOSE PROJECTIONS, ESPECIALLY A 2032  
8 TIMELINE. SO THAT'S KIND OF -- HOPEFULLY THAT'S  
9 RESPONSIVE TO YOUR QUESTION.

10 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES, IT IS. THANK YOU,  
11 MARIA. I THINK IT'S SOMETHING WE JUST NEED TO KEEP  
12 AN EYE ON AS WE GO FORWARD. MY WORRY IS THAT WE  
13 WILL GET TO A POINT WHERE THE ONLY FUNDS THAT ARE  
14 LEFT ARE FOR THIS AREA, THE CNS AREA, AND WE DON'T  
15 HAVE ANY FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FUNDING OTHER PROJECTS.  
16 AND THEN HOW DO WE RUN THE ORGANIZATION AT THAT  
17 POINT? BUT THAT'S A LONG WAYS DOWN THE ROAD, BUT I  
18 THINK IT'S JUST SOMETHING AS WE MOVE ALONG WE NEED  
19 TO KEEP AN EYE ON BECAUSE WE HAVE A HUGE RESEARCH  
20 BUDGET THIS TIME AROUND. THE APPROVAL WAS UP CLOSE  
21 TO \$500 MILLION, SOMETHING LIKE THAT. SO IF WE  
22 SPEND ALL THAT, THAT'S GOING THROUGH MONEY AT A VERY  
23 FAST PACE.

24 DR. MILLAN: ABSOLUTELY. WHAT ROSA  
25 PRESENTED IN TERMS OF WHAT OUR HISTORICAL

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

1 EXPENDITURES HAVE BEEN ON OUR PILLAR PROGRAMS, GIVEN  
2 THE PERCENT OF THOSE KIND OF ORGANIC PROGRAMS THAT  
3 ARE COMING IN, SHE PRESENTED AN ESTIMATE OF HOW THAT  
4 COULD STILL BE FUNDED. AND THEN I THINK SHE -- ROSA  
5 IS RIGHT HERE. I'M SAYING LIKE SHE'S NOT IN THE  
6 ROOM. BUT I THINK THE ESTIMATE OF THESE MEGA  
7 PROGRAMS THAT SHE'S PRESENTING, I THINK AT LEAST  
8 FOUR OR FIVE OF THESE BIG CONSORTIA-TYPE APPROACHES  
9 COULD THEN BE FUNDED, NOT ONLY FOR NEUROPSYCH, BUT  
10 OTHER TYPES OF NEURAL FIELDS. AND THEN IN TOTAL  
11 THAT WOULD COMPOSE THE 1.5 BILLION IN TERMS OF THE  
12 EARMARK FOR NEURO, FOR CNS, THE COMBINATION OF THE  
13 ORGANIC THINGS THAT COME IN THROUGH THE PILLAR PLUS  
14 THIS SPECIAL PROGRAM PROJECT OR CONSORTIUM. AND  
15 THEN THE REMAINDER OF THE FUNDING WOULD BE THEN  
16 AVAILABLE FOR OTHER NON-CNS TYPES OF INITIATIVES  
17 ACROSS THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD. THANK YOU.  
19 GREAT QUESTION, STEVE. PAT.

20 DR. LEVITT: THANKS, ROSA. THAT WAS GREAT  
21 AND I LOVE THE CONCEPTS. I WANT TO TALK A LITTLE  
22 BIT ABOUT THOSE ISSUES AROUND SORT OF THE CONTENT OF  
23 REMIND-L AND REMIND-X. I LOVE THE CONCEPTS.

24 CAN YOU GO TO THE SLIDE WHERE YOU GOT -- I  
25 DON'T KNOW WHAT THE NUMBER IS. IT'S THE SLIDE THAT

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

1 HAS THE REQUIREMENTS IN TERMS OF INVESTIGATORS AND  
2 EFFORT. IF YOU CAN GO TO THAT.

3 DR. CANET-AVILES: YEAH. LET ME SEE. IS  
4 THIS THE ONE?

5 DR. LEVITT: THAT'S GOOD. SO PRINCIPAL  
6 INVESTIGATORS, FOR THE REMIND-L, YOU WANT ONE WHO  
7 HAS CLINICAL EXPERTISE AND ONE WHO HAS COMPUTATIONAL  
8 EXPERTISE, RIGHT?

9 DR. CANET-AVILES: YES. ONE SECOND.

10 DR. LEVITT: THAT'S FINE. THAT'S GOOD. I  
11 JUST NEED MORE CLARIFICATION ABOUT WHAT YOU MEAN BY  
12 THE TEAM. SO WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT FIVE PI'S FOR A  
13 MODEL LIKE THE P50 AT NIH, A PI IS A PROJECT. THESE  
14 ARE ALL INTEGRATED, OF COURSE, AROUND A SPECIFIC  
15 THEME OR HYPOTHESIS FOR DISCOVERY. IS THAT WHAT  
16 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE? FIVE PROJECTS AND ONE OF  
17 THOSE FIVE WOULD BE THE COORDINATING PI, OR ARE YOU  
18 TALKING ABOUT FIVE INVESTIGATORS, SOME OF WHOM MIGHT  
19 BE SERVING THE PURPOSE OF GENERAL LEADERSHIP IN A  
20 CLINICAL AREA FOCUS, AND ONE WOULD BE SERVING IN  
21 GENERAL ALL THE PROJECTS THAT ARE DOING -- THAT HAVE  
22 COMPUTATIONAL COMPONENTS TO THEM?

23 DR. CANET-AVILES: WE ARE TALKING ABOUT --  
24 THANK YOU, PAT, FOR THE QUESTION. VERY RELEVANT.  
25 WE ARE TALKING ABOUT NOT FIVE DISTINCT PROJECTS. WE

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

1 ARE TALKING ABOUT ONE LARGE COLLABORATIVE PROJECT  
2 THAT CAN HAVE DIFFERENT AIMS, THAT DIFFERENT PEOPLE  
3 MIGHT BE WORKING ON, DIFFERENT PI'S. THERE SHOULD  
4 BE ONE PI THAT COORDINATES AND WILL BE THE  
5 ADMINISTRATIVE POINT TO THE AWARD WITH CIRM. AND IT  
6 WILL BE THE PERSON THAT WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR IF  
7 WE HAVE A DISCOVERY ADVISORY PANEL AND THERE IS  
8 SOMETHING THAT NEEDS TO BE IMPLEMENTED, HE WILL BE  
9 RESPONSIBLE TO COORDINATE THINGS. IT WILL BE THE  
10 ONE THAT WILL WRANGLE EVERYBODY TOGETHER TOWARDS  
11 MAKING SURE THAT WE GET TO THE OUTCOMES, THE GOALS.

12 IT DOESN'T NEED TO BE -- WE DON'T NEED ONE  
13 LEAD THAT'S CLINICAL, ONE LEAD THAT'S COMPUTATIONAL.  
14 WHAT WE WANT IS THE EXPERTISE. IT COULD BE THAT THE  
15 OTHER PI, SO WE HAVE FIVE PI'S IS MINIMUM, IT COULD  
16 BE THAT THERE ARE SEVEN, FIVE WE THINK IS A GOOD  
17 NUMBER FOR THESE KIND OF COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS. IT  
18 COULD BE THAT ONE OF THE OTHER PI'S, THE 10 PERCENT  
19 IS A CLINICIAN OF THE DISEASE. THAT WILL BE THE ONE  
20 THAT'S GOING TO BRING THE RELEVANT TYPE OF QUESTIONS  
21 THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THE DISEASE MECHANISMS THAT  
22 WE'LL BE DISCOVERING FOR THE CLINICAL TRIALS, RIGHT.  
23 AND THAT WILL ALSO BE THE CONTACT TO THE PATIENT  
24 POPULATIONS. WE NEED TO HAVE THE END GOAL, AND I  
25 THINK HAVING A CLINICIAN IN THE TEAM IS VERY

1 RELEVANT.

2 THE COMPUTATIONAL BIOLOGY EXPERTISE HAS TO  
3 DO WITH BEING MORE -- HAVING A COMPUTATIONAL  
4 BIOLOGIST WILL MAKE SURE THAT THERE IS SOME VOICE  
5 THERE THAT KEEPS EVERYBODY THINKING ABOUT WHAT  
6 METADATA DO WE NEED TO GATHER. WHAT ARE THE  
7 STANDARDS THAT WE NEED TO HAVE? WHO DO WE NEED TO  
8 TALK? SO THAT'S WHAT WE WANT TO HAVE.

9 DR. LEVITT: THAT ALL MAKES SENSE. THIS  
10 IS ABOUT THE ARCHITECTURE OF THIS, WHICH I THINK IS  
11 REALLY IMPORTANT SO THAT INVESTIGATORS ARE CLEAR  
12 ABOUT IT. IF YOU'VE GOT COLLABORATIONS ACROSS  
13 SITES, IT MEANS EACH SITE IS GOING TO HAVE A  
14 STATEMENT OF WORK, A SET OF RESPONSIBILITIES THAT  
15 THEY HAVE WITH SEPARATE BUDGETS. IT'S UNLIKELY WHAT  
16 YOU'RE LOOKING FOR, IS IT LIKELY THAT IT'S GOING TO  
17 BE AT ONE INSTITUTION? THIS MATTERS BECAUSE OF HOW  
18 YOU WOULD STRUCTURE THIS.

19 AND SO THE REASON -- THERE'S A THEME  
20 AROUND A PROGRAM PROJECT GRANT THAT HAS A SINGULAR  
21 THEME, AND THEN THERE ARE ELEMENTS TO IT. ONE MIGHT  
22 BE EXPERT IN IMAGING THAT'S GOING TO BE DONE, ONE  
23 MIGHT BE EXPERT IN ELECTROPHYSIOLOGY, ET CETERA, BUT  
24 THEY ALL ADDRESS THE CORE THEME, THE CORE QUESTION.

25 AND IT SOUNDS LIKE HERE YOU'VE GOT ONE

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

1 LARGE PROJECT THAT'S GOING TO HAVE MULTIPLE PI'S TO  
2 IT. BUT IF THEY'RE AT DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS, THE  
3 LOGISTICS OF DIVIDING THAT PIE THE WAY THAT PI'S ARE  
4 USED TO OPERATING IS GOING TO BE AN ISSUE. SO I  
5 THINK YOU MAY WANT TO THINK ABOUT HOW YOU WANT TO  
6 STRUCTURE THIS SO THAT IT'S CLEAR WHAT CIRM IS  
7 LOOKING FOR.

8 THE OTHER IS THAT -- AND WE HEARD THIS  
9 FROM SEVERAL PRESENTATIONS. 20-PERCENT EFFORT FOR  
10 LET'S SAY, A SENIOR SCIENTIST WHO HAS THE ABILITY TO  
11 COORDINATE A PROGRAM LIKE THIS IS A HIGH PERCENTAGE,  
12 AND IT'S LIKELY TO ELIMINATE A NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS  
13 WHO WE KNOW, SOME OF WHOM PRESENTED TO US, WHERE  
14 THEY JUST DON'T HAVE THE EFFORT. AND AS YOU KNOW,  
15 LEGALLY WE CAN'T GO OVER A HUNDRED PERCENT. OF  
16 COURSE, WE ALL DO GO OVER A HUNDRED PERCENT, BUT WE  
17 CAN'T LEGALLY GO OVER A HUNDRED PERCENT.

18 SO ONE THOUGHT THAT I HAD AS GOING THROUGH  
19 THE SLIDES IS A COORDINATING PI WOULD HAVE TO  
20 CERTAINLY DESIGNATE 10 PERCENT, BUT THE OTHER PI'S  
21 MIGHT BE AT 5 PERCENT. AND THERE WERE LIKE, FROM  
22 WHAT I CAN RECALL, AT LEAST THREE PRESENTERS WHO  
23 TALKED ABOUT THE EFFORT REQUIREMENTS.

24 I THINK FOR THE REMIND-X FOR THE DISCOVERY  
25 PHASE, I DON'T THINK 10 PERCENT IS AN ISSUE. I

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

1 THINK THOSE ARE FINE. SO THINK ABOUT THAT.

2 I THINK THE DOLLAR AMOUNTS ARE REALLY  
3 ALIGNED WELL WITH WHAT INVESTIGATORS ARE USED TO  
4 WHEN THEY'RE PUTTING TOGETHER A PROGRAM PROJECT, A  
5 P50. AND I THINK I MENTIONED THIS TO YOU BEFORE.  
6 DIFFERENT INSTITUTES AT NIH DO IT IN DIFFERENT WAYS;  
7 BUT WHEN THEY DO THEIR ANALYSES OF RETURN ON  
8 INVESTMENT, THESE PROGRAMS GENERALLY DO REALLY WELL  
9 BECAUSE THEY'RE STRUCTURED AND ORGANIZED WELL.

10 THE OTHER THING TO THINK ABOUT IS FOR THE  
11 ADVISORY PANEL, AND THAT WAS SINGULAR, SO I'M  
12 ASSUMING AN ADVISORY PANEL, BUT YOU'RE LOOKING AT 16  
13 PROJECTS HERE, AND THAT'S A LOT.

14 DR. CANET-AVILES: IT WOULD ONLY BE FOR  
15 THE LARGE ONES. THE SMALLER ONES DON'T NEED AN  
16 ADVISORY PANEL. IT'S FOR THE REMIND-L. IT'S THE  
17 SIX PROJECTS.

18 DR. LEVITT: SO I'M JUST SAYING FROM  
19 EXPERIENCE THEY'RE THERE TO JUST SERVE WHEN SOMEBODY  
20 WOULD SEND THEM A QUESTION OR THEY'RE MEETING TO  
21 REVIEW THE PROGRESS OF THE PROGRAMS. ARE THEY THERE  
22 TO PROVIDE CIRM WITH FEEDBACK AND HOW THINGS ARE  
23 GOING, OR ARE THEY THERE JUST TO BE EXPERT SOURCES?

24 DR. CANET-AVILES: WE WILL USE THEM MAINLY  
25 FOR A YEARLY PROGRESS REVIEW AND PROVIDE ADVICE TO

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

1 THE GRANTEE, THE AWARDEES, AND TO CIRM  
2 RECOMMENDATIONS. BUT I THINK WE WILL ALSO USE THEM  
3 AD HOC. WE MIGHT NOT HAVE ALL THE EXPERTISE  
4 INTERNALLY. IF WE NEED TO USE THEM AS CONSULTANTS  
5 FOR CERTAIN QUESTIONS WHEN WE NEED TO MAXIMIZE THE  
6 OUTCOME OF THESE RESEARCH PROJECTS, WE WILL. SO  
7 THAT COULD BE THE IDEA.

8 DR. LEVITT: YEAH. I DON'T KNOW HOW --  
9 SOME OF US ON THIS CALL HAVE SERVED ON THESE KINDS  
10 OF SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARDS. AND SIX PROJECTS OF  
11 THIS SIZE IS A VERY HEAVY LIFT FOR A SINGLE  
12 COMMITTEE. EVEN IF YOU -- YOU CAN HAVE A LARGE  
13 COMMITTEE AND THEN EACH PERSON GETS ONE OR TWO,  
14 BUT --

15 DR. CANET-AVILES: YEAH. IT'S NOT ONE  
16 COMMITTEE. DISCOVERY ADVISORY PANEL, WE ARE GOING  
17 TO HAVE -- IT'S LIKE THE CLINICAL ADVISORY PANELS OR  
18 THE TRANSLATION ADVISORY PANELS. IT'S NOT THE SAME  
19 THREE PEOPLE FOR ALL THE AWARDEES AND FOR ALL THE  
20 AWARDS. IT'S A COMBINATION. SO WE'LL HAVE A POOL  
21 OF, SAY, 15 EXPERT CONSULTANTS, AND WE WILL MIX AND  
22 MATCH DEPENDING ON WHAT'S THE PROJECT THAT WE ARE  
23 LOOKING AT. SO PROBABLY EACH ONE OF THEM MIGHT HAVE  
24 A MAXIMUM OF TWO PROJECTS THAT THEY WILL BE ADVISING  
25 ON.

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

1 DR. LEVITT: OKAY. ONE THING TO THINK  
2 ABOUT IS THAT FOR ALL P50S THAT I'M AWARE OF, THEY  
3 HAVE TO HAVE A SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND  
4 THEY'RE THE ONES WHO DEFINE IT. A SCIENTIFIC  
5 ADVISORY COMMITTEE ESSENTIALLY DOES WHAT YOU JUST  
6 SAID. THEY MEET ANNUALLY. AND THAT'S ANOTHER MODEL  
7 WHERE EACH OF THE LARGE PROGRAMS WOULD HAVE AN  
8 ADVISORY COMMITTEE THAT WOULD SEND A REPORT TO CIRM.  
9 AND THEY MAY BE AS OR MORE EFFECTIVE BECAUSE THEN  
10 YOU HAVE THE INVESTIGATORS HAVING SOME INPUT INTO  
11 THE EXPERTISE THAT THEY FEEL IS GOING TO BE MOST  
12 IMPORTANT.

13 THE ONLY THING I JUST WANTED TO MENTION, I  
14 HAVE SOME WORDSMITHING THAT I'LL SEND YOU. I'M NOT  
15 GOING TO BRING IT UP NOW. IT MAY BE WORTH THINKING  
16 ABOUT, PARTICULARLY FOR THE LARGE PROJECTS THAT HAVE  
17 A BRIDGE WITH CLINICAL DISORDERS, HAVING, IN  
18 ADDITION TO A DEI PLAN, A COMMUNITY ADVISORY  
19 COMMITTEE MAY BE WORTH THINKING ABOUT. CAC'S ARE  
20 REALLY HELPFUL IN THINKING ABOUT, PARTICULARLY SINCE  
21 A LOT OF THIS INVOLVES PATIENT MATERIAL THAT IS  
22 BEING USED, ET CETERA, AND HAVING A CAC, A SMALL  
23 CAC, FOR THE PROGRAMS MIGHT BE REALLY, I THINK,  
24 IMPORTANT. AND WE HAVE PATIENT ADVOCATES ON OUR  
25 BOARD THAT I THINK MAY FEEL THE SAME WAY. FOR US

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

1 AND MY OWN PROJECTS, IT'S BEEN INCREDIBLY HELPFUL TO  
2 GET INSIGHT FROM A COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
3 THAT'S RELEVANT TO THE STUDIES THAT WE ARE DOING.  
4 SO THAT'S SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT. THANK YOU.

5 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, PAT. SO LET  
6 ME JUST TOUCH SOMETHING. WHEN YOU SAID THE PI  
7 COMMITMENT, WHAT WERE YOU SUGGESTING FOR REMIND-L?

8 DR. LEVITT: SO EVERY P50, WHICH IS THE  
9 NIH TERM FOR WHAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING, HAS A  
10 SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE. IT'S USUALLY THREE  
11 OR FOUR.

12 DR. CANET-AVILES: NO. NO. NO. THE  
13 PERCENTAGE OF THE PI.

14 DR. LEVITT: I WAS GOING TO RECOMMEND,  
15 BASED ON THE FEEDBACK WE GOT AND BASED ON MY  
16 UNDERSTANDING OF WHERE -- THIS IS GOING TO DRAW --  
17 CIRM WANTS TO DRAW THE MOST IMPRESSIVE SCIENTISTS  
18 INTO THIS PROGRAM. WE HEARD FROM ONE TODAY. DOES  
19 HE HAVE 20 PERCENT TO COMMIT? HE'S NOT ON THE CALL  
20 NOW. I'M NOT ASKING HIM. EVEN IF HE WAS, I'M NOT  
21 ASKING HIM TO REVEAL. BUT 20 PERCENT FOR THAT KIND  
22 OF A LABORATORY FOR THE PI IS A LOT TO ASK. AND I  
23 DON'T KNOW HOW OTHERS ON OUR TASK FORCE FEEL, BUT --

24 DR. CANET-AVILES: COULD IT BE THAT WE  
25 ALLOW -- WE ARE ASKING FOR SOMEONE THAT'S MORE NEW

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

1 TO THE FIELD, BUT IS A PI BE THE COORDINATING PI AT  
2 A 20 PERCENT? AND THEN THE MORE -- I'M JUST  
3 THINKING. WE ARE ASKING FOR AT LEAST FIVE PEOPLE.  
4 WE CAN DISCUSS. WE CAN DISCUSS. I HEAR YOU. AND  
5 WE WERE THE SAME AS YOU. 15 PERCENT, COULD THAT BE  
6 FAIR, 15 PERCENT, A COORDINATING PI?

7 DR. LEVITT: IF YOU HAVE FOUR AT 5  
8 PERCENT -- LET'S SAY YOU HAVE TWO AT 10 PERCENT AND  
9 THREE AT 5 PERCENT. THAT'S 20. THAT'S 35 PERCENT.  
10 THAT'S .35 FOR A FACULTY COMMITMENT. THAT'S PRETTY  
11 SUBSTANTIAL FOR A PROGRAM. I LOOK AT IT AS A SUM,  
12 NOT AS INDIVIDUALS. AND I DON'T KNOW. THE GROUP  
13 WILL HAVE TO CONTEMPLATE THIS. I HAVE MY OWN VIEWS,  
14 THAT 10 PERCENT FOR THE COORDINATING PI, AND I WOULD  
15 SAY THAT IT WOULD NOT BE A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE A  
16 JUNIOR INVESTIGATOR TO BE THE COORDINATING PI.

17 DR. CANET-AVILES: I HEAR YOU.

18 DR. LEVITT: IT'S A LOT OF WORK. IT TAKES  
19 SOME JUGGLING TO DO IT WELL BECAUSE THERE'S ALWAYS  
20 CONFLICTS THAT ARISE, NOT BAD CONFLICTS, BUT THERE'S  
21 ALWAYS ISSUES THAT ARISE. AND I THINK IT'S  
22 CHALLENGING FOR A JUNIOR PERSON TO DO THAT. I  
23 SHOULD LET OTHERS SPEAK.

24 DR. CANET-AVILES: LET ME SEE. I WAS JUST  
25 TRYING TO SEE IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER.

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

1           CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: ROSA, WE'LL HAVE TO  
2 CONTINUE THIS CONVERSATION OFFLINE, I THINK, BUT  
3 IT'S AN IMPORTANT POINT. FRED.

4           DR. FISHER: THANKS. I WON'T BELABOR IT,  
5 BUT I THINK THIS SLIDE, I REALLY WANT TO THANK PAT  
6 AND STEVE FOR KICKING THIS OFF BECAUSE I THINK THEY  
7 ALSO STARTED WHERE I WANTED TO START.

8           IT ISN'T CLEAR, BUT I'D LIKE TO SEE, NOT  
9 TODAY AND I DON'T EVEN WANT TO HEAR ABOUT IT TODAY  
10 BECAUSE THERE ISN'T TIME, BUT I WANT TO UNDERSTAND  
11 HOW THE STAFF AND ANY OTHER OTHERS INVOLVED IN  
12 PUTTING ALL OF THIS TOGETHER ACTUALLY TOOK IN THE  
13 REASON WHY THERE IS NOT MORE NEUROPSYCH MONEY BEING  
14 SPENT. IT'S NOT BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW ABOUT US.  
15 IT'S NOT BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT THE MONEY. WHAT WE  
16 HEARD WAS IT'S TOO MUCH EFFORT FOR TOO LITTLE  
17 DOLLARS.

18           SO HOW DID THE CIRM TEAM TAKE THAT  
19 FEEDBACK AND BUILD IT INTO THIS PLAN SO THAT IN THE  
20 END WE DON'T FIND OURSELVES LOOKING AT ANOTHER PIE  
21 CHART THAT SAYS, OH, NEUROPSYCH WAS STILL  
22 UNDERFUNDED AND WE PUT THIS WHOLE GREAT PROGRAM  
23 TOGETHER BECAUSE WE DIDN'T PAY ATTENTION TO THE  
24 FEEDBACK WE GOT FROM THEM, THAT IT'S TOO MUCH WORK  
25 FOR TOO LITTLE DOLLARS. AGAIN, I DON'T WANT TO TAKE

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

1 THE TIME NOW. THAT'S ONE.

2 IF YOU COULD GO BACK TO THE SLIDE THAT  
3 STEVE TALKED ABOUT THAT SHOWED ALL THE ARROWS AND  
4 THE SPENDING. IT'S AFTER THAT BECAUSE IT GETS DOWN  
5 TO A TOTAL OF BARELY...

6 SO WHAT'S NOT HELPFUL ABOUT THIS SLIDE IS  
7 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT A NEUROPSYCH PROGRAM, AND YOU  
8 NEVER -- AND IT'S -- SO DO I UNDERSTAND WE'RE  
9 TALKING ABOUT 240 MILLION OUT OF 1.5 BILLION? IS  
10 THAT WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT SPENDING ON  
11 NEUROPSYCH?

12 DR. CANET-AVILES: NO. AS I MENTIONED IN  
13 THE PREVIOUS SLIDE, LET ME JUST SHOW HERE, WHAT WE  
14 WERE PROPOSING IS THAT WE WOULD BE STARTING WITH  
15 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC AS A PILOT. AS WE MOVE FORWARD, WE  
16 WOULD BE INCLUDING OTHER DISEASES AND MORE WORKING  
17 FOCUSED ON SYSTEMS. SO RESEARCH MECHANISMS, DISEASE  
18 MECHANISMS, NEUROIMMUNE AXIS, AND INCLUDE  
19 NEURODEGENERATIVE, NEUROPSYCHIATRIC,  
20 NEURODEVELOPMENTAL, FOR EXAMPLE, NEUROVASCULAR, THE  
21 SAME. THOSE ARE EXAMPLES, BUT WE COULD START -- WE  
22 COULD INCREASE THE SCOPE OF DISEASES BY FOCUSING ON  
23 SYSTEMS. THAT'S HOW WE WERE PROPOSING TO MOVE  
24 FORWARD.

25 SO, NO, THE \$648 MILLION COULD ACTUALLY BE

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

1 FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES, DISCOVERY OF DISEASE  
2 MECHANISMS, NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES. ONLY THE FOUR  
3 FIRST YEARS COULD BE FOCUSED ON NEUROPSYCHIATRIC.  
4 THANK YOU.

5 DR. FISHER: SO REMIND-L AND REMIND-X ARE  
6 NOT EXCLUSIVELY NEUROPSYCH. THEY ARE --

7 DR. CANET-AVILES: CORRECT.

8 DR. FISHER: THIS IS WHAT YOU'RE CALLING  
9 THIS WHOLE EXPANSION. AND NOW MY QUESTION IS WHERE  
10 DID THESE OTHER INDICATIONS COME FROM BECAUSE TO MY  
11 KNOWLEDGE THEY HAVEN'T BEEN DISCUSSED BY THIS  
12 COMMITTEE.

13 DR. CANET-AVILES: NO.

14 DR. FISHER: THESE ARE THE THINGS THAT WE  
15 SHOULD BE FOCUSING ON IN FUTURE YEARS.

16 DR. CANET-AVILES: CORRECT. CORRECT. WE  
17 WOULD BE COMING IN FOUR YEARS OR THREE YEARS TIME.  
18 AS WE ARE MOVING TOWARDS THE NEXT SET OF RFA'S, WE  
19 WOULD COME TO THE BOARD WITH THE SPECIFICATION -- WE  
20 COULD COME WITH AN OUTCOMES ANALYSIS OF WHAT WE HAVE  
21 DONE WITH THE MONEY OF NEUROPSYCH AND WHAT WE THINK  
22 THAT MIGHT BE BEST TO LEVERAGE IT WITH, BUT UP TO  
23 YOU TO DECIDE WHERE YOU WANT US TO FOCUS BASED ON  
24 WHATEVER ANALYSIS YOU WANT US TO DO.

25 SO THIS IS JUST TO SHOW THAT THE REMIND-L

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

1 AND X, THIS REMIND CONCEPT STRUCTURE IS FOR  
2 DISCOVERY IN NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES. AND WE ARE  
3 GOING TO APPLY IT FIRST TO NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, AND  
4 THEN WE WILL COME TO YOU TO TELL US WHAT ELSE YOU  
5 WANT US TO START BRINGING IN, BUT GIVING YOU  
6 OUTCOMES, GIVING YOU WHAT IS IT THAT WE'VE ACHIEVED  
7 IN THE NEXT THREE TO FOUR YEARS.

8 DR. FISHER: SO YOU HAVE TO TAKE OFF ANY  
9 OTHER DISEASE INDICATIONS, CALL IT INDICATION X,  
10 INDICATION Y, INDICATION Z. WHEN YOU START PUTTING  
11 THINGS IN WRITING, YOU CREATE THE EXPECTATION THAT  
12 THAT'S WHERE THIS IS STARTING. JUST LIKE IT STILL  
13 REMAINS A MYSTERY HOW WE ENDED UP STARTING ON  
14 NEUROPSYCH, BUT IT IS WHAT IT IS. AND WHEN YOU  
15 START PUTTING THINGS DOWN, IT SEEMS TO HAVE THE  
16 SETTING-IN-STONE FUNCTION.

17 SO IF YOU'RE JUST TALKING ABOUT ADDING  
18 DISEASE INDICATION, HAVE IT JUST SAY LITERALLY  
19 DISEASE INDICATION NO. 1, NO. 2, NO. 3 SO YOU SHOW  
20 IT GROWING.

21 SO WHAT YOU STARTED WITH HERE WAS WE ARE  
22 LOOKING AT A PROGRAM THAT APPARENTLY HAS A SUBSET OF  
23 COST. NOW, IF YOU CLICK ON ANOTHER SLIDE WHERE YOU  
24 GET TO THE 648 MILLION, WE GET TO 648 MILLION OF  
25 TOTAL COSTS FOR THIS NEW INITIATIVE, WHICH IS 43

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

1 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL MINIMUM FOR NEURO. GIVEN THAT  
2 MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT CIRM HAS ALREADY SPENT IN  
3 THE PRIOR FUNDING CYCLE 1.5 BILLION OR MAYBE IT DID  
4 OR MAYBE IT DIDN'T, I DON'T KNOW. I DON'T WANT TO  
5 REHASH THIS, BUT I NEED TO UNDERSTAND WHETHER WE ARE  
6 ACTUALLY GOING TO NOT BE ABLE TO FUND THINGS THAT WE  
7 WOULD WANT TO FUND BECAUSE WE ARE LOOKING AT CARVING  
8 OUT 43 PERCENT OF THE 1.5 BILLION FOR NEURO, WHICH I  
9 WANT TO KNOW WHAT THAT TOTAL IS FOR NEUROPSYCH, PLUS  
10 SOME OTHER THINGS.

11 SO THIS SLIDE WHERE YOU HAVE THESE ARROWS,  
12 LIKE, IT'S MISLEADING BECAUSE YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT  
13 REMIND-L AND REMIND-X, WHICH IN THESE FUTURE YEARS  
14 IS GOING TO BE SOMETHING OTHER THAN NEUROPSYCH, BUT  
15 WHAT YOU'VE PUT UNDER THE ARROWS, I THINK, IS  
16 FUNDING STRICTLY CONNECTED TO NEUROPSYCH.

17 DR. CANET-AVILES: NO. NO.

18 DR. FISHER: IT'S 12 TEAMS, 144 MILLION.  
19 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT NEUROPSYCH.

20 DR. CANET-AVILES: NO. NO. NO. FOR  
21 REMIND-L, IT COULD BE FOR DIFFERENT DISEASES. IT  
22 COULD BE THAT IN YEARS 2028 TO 2031 WE DECIDE THAT  
23 WHAT CIRM IS GOING TO FUND IS RESEARCH AROUND THE  
24 NEUROIMMUNE AXIS. THIS IS MECHANISMS ACROSS ALL  
25 NEURO DISEASES, AND THAT WOULD BE THE FUNDING.

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

1 TWELVE TEAMS COULD BE REALLY LARGE BECAUSE THOSE ARE  
2 \$2.5 MILLION-A-YEAR TEAMS. SO IT'S LIKE \$10  
3 MILLION-A-YEAR AWARDS, \$10 MILLION AWARDS, 12 OF  
4 THEM. THAT'S A LOT OF MONEY THAT WE WOULD BE  
5 FUNDING, BUT IT'S NOT NEUROPSYCH. IT'S TO DO WITH  
6 ALL NEURO.

7 AND I TOOK YOUR POINT THAT WE NEED TO  
8 REMOVE FROM THIS SLIDE 17 THE INDICATIONS. WE ARE  
9 STARTING WITH NEUROPSYCH NOW. THE TOTAL WILL BE  
10 \$168 MILLION FOR NEUROPSYCH, BUT THE 648 MILLION  
11 COULD BE FOR ALL NEURO DISEASES AND DISCOVERY. SO  
12 THIS COULD BE WHAT WE ARE ASKING FOR THE NEURO  
13 STRATEGY AT CIRM. THE DISCOVERY PART WE ESTIMATE  
14 MIGHT TAKE ABOUT 42 PERCENT OF THE FUNDING,  
15 INCLUDING WHAT WE WILL SPEND IN THE DISC PILLAR  
16 PROGRAM AS WELL.

17 DR. FISHER: IF YOU WANT TO KNOW MORE  
18 ABOUT THE CONFUSION OF THIS SLIDE, I WON'T TAKE THE  
19 TIME HERE BECAUSE I SEE LEONDRA HAS HER HAND UP.  
20 THIS IS A VERY CONFUSING SLIDE. I DON'T UNDERSTAND  
21 WHAT THE SALMON ARROW IS AT 235 MILLION. AND IF I  
22 UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, THE TOTAL COMMITMENT  
23 OF 1.5 BILLION DEDICATED TO NEUROPSYCH IS 168  
24 MILLION, WHICH IS 11.2 PERCENT OF THE 1.5 BILLION.  
25 THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO UNDERSTAND BECAUSE WHEN YOU'RE

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

1 TALKING ABOUT STARTING WITH A PILOT AROUND  
2 NEUROPSYCH, THE QUESTION IS HOW MUCH ARE YOU GOING  
3 TO DEVOTE TO THAT? AND THE ANSWER IS 11.2 PERCENT  
4 BASED ON WHAT YOU'RE TELLING ME TODAY, BUT I COULD  
5 NOT DERIVE THAT FROM ANY OF THESE SLIDES.

6 AND THEN THERE NEEDS TO BE A RATIONALE FOR  
7 WHY 11.2 PERCENT IS THE RIGHT NUMBER, PARTICULARLY  
8 SINCE WHAT WE HEARD IS THE OBSTACLE IS NOT THE  
9 ABSENCE OF A PROGRAM. THE OBSTACLE IS CIRM DOESN'T  
10 PAY ENOUGH MONEY AND REQUIRES TOO MUCH EFFORT. AND  
11 I DON'T SEE THAT ADDRESSED, AND YOU'VE CREATED A  
12 MASSIVE PROGRAM THAT ACTUALLY I DON'T HAVE ANY  
13 EVIDENCE THAT YOU'VE ACTUALLY SOLVED THE PROBLEM.  
14 I'LL STOP THERE.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU. FRED AND  
16 ROSA, PERHAPS YOU CAN GET THROUGH SOME OF THESE  
17 ISSUES OFFLINE. LEONDRA.

18 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: THANK YOU. I'LL BE  
19 QUICK.

20 FIRST, THANK YOU. THANK YOU FOR THE  
21 CONCEPTUALIZATION AND THE TIME THAT STAFF PUT INTO  
22 THIS REMIND. I LOVE IT, BY THE WAY, THE WAY IT'S  
23 LABELED.

24 I DO AGREE WITH FRED. THERE IS SOME  
25 CONFUSION HERE, AND I WOULD LIKE CLARITY. SO

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

1     WHATEVER CONVERSATION OR WHATEVER YOU WORK THROUGH  
2     OFFLINE, IF YOU COULD REPORT BACK TO THE REST OF US.  
3     FOR THOSE OF US THAT ARE NOT QUITE CAUGHT UP, I  
4     WOULD APPRECIATE THAT.

5             AND ALSO TO FRED'S POINT AROUND THE MONEY  
6     AND THE EFFORT, THAT TRULY WAS WHAT STOOD OUT TO ME  
7     AT ONE OF OUR LAST MEETINGS. I KNOW IT WAS  
8     REITERATED AT OUR ICOC MEETING A FEW WEEKS AGO. AND  
9     SO I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT DOESN'T GET LOST IN  
10    ALL OF THIS. AND SO I THINK THAT THERE'S  
11    OPPORTUNITIES TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION.

12            ALSO TO PAT'S POINT AROUND THE COMMUNITY  
13    ADVISORY COMMITTEE, IT'S SOMETHING THAT I RAISED AT  
14    OUR LAST MEETING, AND I'M GLAD TO HEAR IT RAISED  
15    HERE AGAIN. I THINK THERE REALLY NEEDS TO BE SPACE  
16    AND ROOM FOR IT, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE DIRECT  
17    FEEDBACK THAT WE'VE RECEIVED, SOME OF WHICH FRED  
18    JUST RELAYED. SO I DO HOPE THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE  
19    SOME EFFORTS TO DO THAT. BUT, AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR  
20    THIS. I KNOW YOU ALL ARE WORKING THIS OUT. I'M  
21    GLAD WE'RE HAVING THIS MEETING SO YOU CAN HEAR  
22    DIRECTLY FROM US WHAT SOME OF THE KINKS MIGHT BE OR  
23    BETTER WAYS TO MAKE IT CLEAR SO THAT EVERYBODY,  
24    BECAUSE IF WE'RE NOT CLEAR, BELIEVE YOU ME, OTHERS  
25    WON'T BE EITHER AS THIS MOVES FORWARD. SO

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

1 APPRECIATE THAT. THANK YOU.

2 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU. GREAT  
3 FEEDBACK.

4 DR. SOUTHARD: I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT I  
5 THINK THIS IS A REALLY GOOD START AT AN ISSUE THAT  
6 WE WERE TRYING TO GET TO IS UNDERSTANDING WHY  
7 NOTHING HAD BEEN DONE AT ALL ON NEUROPSYCH. AND  
8 THIS IS AN EFFORT TO BEGIN TO CURE THAT, THAT I  
9 THINK IS ACTUALLY PRETTY CLEAR AND OUTSTANDING.

10 AND MY ONLY QUESTION WOULD BE IS THERE ANY  
11 POSSIBILITY OF ACCELERATING THE TIMELINE ON THIS?  
12 BECAUSE AS -- IT'S A LOT, BUT IT'S A LONG TIME, AND  
13 NEUROPSYCH HAS BEEN SO UNDERFOCUSED ON, THAT  
14 WHATEVER WE CAN DO TO MOVE IT FORWARD, I THINK,  
15 WOULD BE A GREAT THING. BUT I THINK THIS IS A GOOD  
16 START PERSONALLY.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARV.

18 CAN I ASK SOMEBODY A PROCESS QUESTION? WE  
19 ARE HAVING TO WRAP UP HERE. DO WE FORMALLY VOTE TO  
20 SEND THIS ON TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, OR DO WE  
21 MAKE A RECOMMENDATION, OR DO WE HAVE ANY RULE AT ALL  
22 ABOUT WHAT OUR FINAL ACT IS HERE TODAY?

23 MR. TOCHER: SURE, LARRY. THIS IS SCOTT  
24 BACK AT CIRM. IT'S THE PLEASURE OF THE COMMITTEE,  
25 BUT IN NORMAL COURSE THE RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE TO

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

1 FORWARD TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE WITH A  
2 RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE AND FULL BOARD TO  
3 ADOPT IT.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. SO WE CAN  
5 MAKE A VOTED RECOMMENDATION. SO CAN SOMEBODY MAKE A  
6 MOTION PLEASE?

7 DR. SOUTHARD: I WOULD MOVE WITH -- AFTER  
8 CLARIFICATIONS AS TO THE SLIDE, THAT THIS MOVE  
9 FORWARD TO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE.

10 DR. GASSON: I SECOND.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU. LET'S  
12 SEE. A ROLL CALL VOTE. MARIANNE.

13 MR. TOCHER: JUST A SECOND. LARRY,  
14 THERE'S BOARD COMMENT ON THE MOTION. WE'LL TAKE  
15 THAT NOW. LOOKS LIKE STEVE'S HAND IS RAISED, AND  
16 THEN WE WOULD HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT AFTER THAT.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY.

18 MR. JUELSGAARD: SO MARV'S MOTION ACTUALLY  
19 OPENS THE DOOR TO THIS QUESTION BECAUSE HE DIDN'T  
20 APPROVE -- HE DID MOVE THAT THIS PRESENTATION PER SE  
21 BE FORWARDED TO THE SCIENTIFIC SUBCOMMITTEE, BUT  
22 WITH MODIFICATIONS. AND I GO BACK TO SOMETHING THAT  
23 FRED WAS TALKING ABOUT AND PAT TOO, FOR THAT MATTER.  
24 ARE WE READY FOR PRIME TIME WITH THIS? I DON'T WANT  
25 TO GO RECOMMENDING SOMETHING TO THE SCIENTIFIC

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

1 SUBCOMMITTEE, AND LEONDRA SAID THE SAME THING,  
2 THAT'S NOT QUITE FULLY BAKED. THIS IS PRETTY  
3 IMPORTANT WHAT WE ARE PLANNING ON DOING, AND IT'S  
4 NOT CLEAR TO ME THAT WE ARE AT THAT POINT. I'D  
5 RATHER TAKE A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME AND BEG THE  
6 ICOC'S INDULGENCE ULTIMATELY IN ORDER TO HAVE  
7 SOMETHING THAT WE ARE ALL SETTLED AS A GOOD PLAN TO  
8 MOVE FORWARD.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: FRED.

10 DR. FISHER: WHAT STEVE SAID. AND IF  
11 IT -- IF THIS MOTION DOES COME TO A VOTE, I WILL  
12 UNFORTUNATELY HAVE TO VOTE NO. IT'S NOT READY.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARIA MILLAN.

14 DR. MILLAN: IT MAY NOT ANSWER ALL THE  
15 QUESTIONS, BUT I WANTED TO, I THINK, ANSWER THE  
16 QUESTION ABOUT THIS 11 PERCENT. THE 235 MILLION  
17 THAT IS ON THE SALMON ARROW, I BELIEVE, IS THE TOTAL  
18 EXPENDITURES FOR ALL DISCOVERY PROGRAMS COMING  
19 THROUGH THE USUAL PILLARS FOR NEURO, NOT NEUROPSYCH,  
20 ALL OF NEURO. AND I BELIEVE THAT THAT GOT ADDED TO  
21 THE PROPOSED EXPENDITURES FOR THESE BIGGER PROGRAMS  
22 AND THAT GAVE RISE TO THE 648 MILLION. AND THE  
23 BALANCE OF THAT WOULD BE WHAT'S AVAILABLE FOR OTHER  
24 PROGRAMS, INCLUDING TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL.

25 SO IT MAY NOT MAKE A DIFFERENCE, BUT I

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

1 JUST WANTED TO POINT OUT MY UNDERSTANDING OF THIS  
2 235 MILLION. SO THE --

3 DR. CANET-AVILES: I CAN EXPLAIN. I  
4 DECIDED THAT WE CLARIFY --

5 DR. FISHER: I NEED TO GO BACK. WE DON'T  
6 HAVE TIME TO GO BACK AND GET INTO THE GRANULAR  
7 DETAIL. IT'S A GOOD EXAMPLE OF WHY WE NEED ANOTHER  
8 MEETING TO TALK THROUGH ALL OF THIS BECAUSE 235  
9 MILLION ON NEURO IN THE PAST CYCLE DOESN'T MAKE  
10 SENSE EITHER.

11 DR. CANET-AVILES: I CAN EXPLAIN, BUT I  
12 DIDN'T THINK WE HAD THE TIME. SO I THINK PERHAPS WE  
13 HAVE ANOTHER MEETING, AND I CAN MAKE THE  
14 CLARIFICATIONS THAT EVERYBODY IS ASKING. THIS IS  
15 EASY. THIS WAS A BIG BITE TO BRING INTO THE TASK  
16 FORCE, AND I'M HAPPY TO CLARIFY. IT'S EASY. IT'S  
17 VERY EASY ALL THESE QUESTIONS. AND I APPRECIATE  
18 THEM. IT MAKES ME REALIZE WHAT'S NOT  
19 UNDERSTANDABLE.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARIA BONNEVILLE.

21 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: I WAS JUST GOING  
22 TO ADD I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT AT THE NEXT MEETING,  
23 MARIA AND TEAM, IS TO COME BACK WITH THE ANSWERS TO  
24 SOME OF THE THINGS THAT WERE BROUGHT UP OUTSIDE OF  
25 THIS SPECIFICALLY, BUT ALSO ARE WE -- IS IT ENOUGH

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

1 MONEY? HOW DID WE COME TO THOSE CONCLUSIONS?  
2 WHAT'S THE PERCENT EFFORT? HOW DID WE ARRIVE AT ALL  
3 OF THAT BECAUSE I THINK THERE HAS BEEN IN THE PAST  
4 SEVERAL MEETINGS A CALL TO RESEARCH SOME OF THESE  
5 ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UP ON MORE THAN ONE  
6 OCCASION. SO I THINK IT WOULD BE REALLY HELPFUL.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: STEVE.

8 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. I'M JUST GOING TO  
9 BASICALLY REINFORCE SOMETHING THAT FRED SAID DURING  
10 THE COURSE OF HIS SOLILOQUY. HAVE WE SOCIALIZED  
11 WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO DO IN TERMS OF FUNDING WITH  
12 ANY OF THE FOLKS THAT HAVE MADE PRESENTATIONS BEFORE  
13 OR OTHER RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS OR ACADEMIC  
14 INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THE STATE? IN OTHER WORDS, THE  
15 QUESTION ON THE TABLE IS ARE WE WILLING TO GRANT  
16 ENOUGH MONEY TO MAKE A DENT IN THIS? DO WE KNOW  
17 THAT? WE PROVIDED SOME AMOUNT OF MONEY AND SOME  
18 TIME PERIOD. IS THAT REALLY SUFFICIENT OR NOT? I  
19 WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THAT PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE OF THIS  
20 GROUP SAY YES. THAT'S GREAT. THAT'S PERFECT.  
21 THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE NEED. OR, NO, WAIT A MINUTE.  
22 THAT'S NOT QUITE ENOUGH. WE WOULDN'T TAKE OUR TIME  
23 TO APPLY FOR A GRANT. BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO RUN  
24 INTO THAT PROBLEM AGAIN. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT  
25 WHAT WE DO WE ARE GOING TO BE SUCCESSFUL AT DOING.

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

1 DR. CANET-AVILES: THE ANSWER, STEVE, IS  
2 YES, WE HAVE. WE HAVE ALSO BEEN TALKING TO THE NIMH  
3 WHICH WOULD BE THE FUNDING AGENCY AT THE FEDERAL  
4 LEVEL THAT HAS BEEN GRANTING AWARDS LIKE THIS.  
5 WE'VE BEEN DOING LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OF WHAT'S FUNDED  
6 OUT THERE. WE'VE BEEN TALKING TO RESEARCHERS. WE  
7 HAVE TO BE CAREFUL BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A CONCEPT  
8 EVEN. SO IF WE PUT TOO MUCH SWEETNESS IN THEIR  
9 MOUTH AND THEN WE DON'T GIVE IT TO THEM, THEY WILL  
10 THINK THAT, BUT WE HAVE. WE HAVE ACTUALLY BEEN  
11 TALKING TO THE PEOPLE THAT SPOKE AND OTHERS, AND  
12 WE'VE BEEN GOING TO MEETINGS AS WELL. AND EVERYBODY  
13 IS VERY EXCITED AND WAITING FOR THIS TO BE OUT.

14 MR. JUELSGAARD: GREAT. THANK YOU, ROSA.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: PAT.

16 DR. LEVITT: I WAS JUST GOING TO COMMENT  
17 THAT THERE'S ENOUGH EXPERTISE ON THIS COMMITTEE  
18 TO -- THERE'S NOT A FORMULA. THERE'S NOT GOING TO  
19 BE A FORMULA THAT SAYS WE NEED EXACTLY THIS AMOUNT  
20 OF MONEY TO ADDRESS THE GAPS THAT HAVE BEEN  
21 IDENTIFIED BY THOSE WHO HAVE PRESENTED AND WHAT THIS  
22 TASK FORCE HAS ADDRESSED. THERE'S GAPS IN EVERY  
23 AREA OF BRAIN DISEASES AND DISORDERS EVERYWHERE. SO  
24 WE'VE GOTTEN INPUT. THERE'S CERTAIN PRESSURE POINTS  
25 THAT WE KNOW ABOUT, AND THE FUNDING LEVELS ARE GOING

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

1 TO BE TO SOME DEGREE SUBJECTIVE. IT'S JUST THE WAY  
2 IT IS. WE CAN'T PREDICT THAT IT'S GOING TO BE 550  
3 VERSUS \$750 MILLION. AND IF WE GO TO 750, THAT WILL  
4 BE ENOUGH. WHO KNOWS WHAT'S GOING TO BE ENOUGH? IS  
5 THERE ANYONE ON THIS COMMITTEE WHO CAN TELL ME WHAT  
6 THE FORMULA IS?

7 SO I THINK WE DO HAVE TO HAVE ANOTHER  
8 MEETING TO GIVE ROSA AND THE TEAM A CHANCE TO MAKE  
9 THE EDITS AND SUGGESTIONS. AND MAYBE BETWEEN NOW  
10 AND THAT MEETING, SOME OFFLINE CONVERSATIONS WITH  
11 SOME FOLKS HERE ABOUT UNDERSTANDING THE DOLLAR  
12 AMOUNTS, WHICH I THINK CAN BE SOMEWHAT CONFUSING.

13 THAT'S MY RECOMMENDATION AND THEN WE HAVE  
14 TO GET ON WITH THE VOTE. THE EXPECTATION THAT WE'RE  
15 GOING TO COME UP WITH A FORMULA THAT'S GOING TO TELL  
16 US EXACTLY HOW MUCH MONEY IS GOING TO BE THE RIGHT  
17 AMOUNT OF MONEY IS JUST NOT GOING TO HAPPEN. THAT'S  
18 IT.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, PAT.

20 SCOTT, PROCESS QUESTION. WHERE DO WE GO  
21 FROM HERE?

22 MR. TOCHER: WELL, THE MOTION THAT HAS  
23 BEEN MADE AND SECONDED ACTUALLY, TECHNICALLY BELONGS  
24 TO THE WHOLE OF THE TASK FORCE NOW. LISTENING TO  
25 THE COMMENT, I THINK MAYBE PROCEDURALLY YOU COULD

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

1 JUST ASK, IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION, THAT WE TABLE THE  
2 MOTION UNTIL ANOTHER MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE TO  
3 SEE A REFINED PROPOSAL AND TAKE UP THE MOTION AT  
4 THAT TIME AFTER THE PRESENTATION AT THAT MEETING.  
5 AND THAT WE WOULD SCHEDULE THAT MEETING, OF COURSE,  
6 BEFORE THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: AND DO WE DO THAT  
8 BEFORE OR AFTER WE GET PUBLIC COMMENT?

9 MR. TOCHER: YOU CAN DO THAT AFTER YOU  
10 RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT OR NOW. EITHER IS FINE.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: IS THERE ANYBODY ON  
12 THE LINE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT? BECAUSE IF THERE'S  
13 SOMEBODY WHAT WANTS TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES, THAT  
14 COULD BE HELPFUL.

15 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: THERE LOOKS LIKE  
16 THERE MIGHT BE A COUPLE. BUT IF YOU ARE, YOU CAN DO  
17 STAR NINE TO BE PUT IN THE QUEUE IF YOU'D LIKE TO  
18 MAKE A COMMENT. THERE ARE NONE POPPING UP, LARRY.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: NO COMMENT. SO THEN  
20 I THINK WE SHOULD DO WHAT SCOTT SUGGESTED. IF THOSE  
21 WHO PROPOSED THE ORIGINAL MOTIONS ARE IN AGREEMENT,  
22 PLEASE LET US KNOW.

23 DR. SOUTHARD: FINE WITH ME.

24 DR. GASSON: YES.

25 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. GREAT. NEXT

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

1 STEP IS ANOTHER TASK FORCE MEETING THAT WILL ADDRESS  
2 THE ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED ABOUT DOLLARS,  
3 EFFORT, SOCIALIZING WITH THE COMMUNITY, AND SOME  
4 CLARIFICATION OF THE TIMING AND GROWTH OF REMIND-L  
5 AND REMIND-X. DO I HAVE THAT RIGHT?

6 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD. OKAY. ROSA,  
8 OKAY?

9 DR. CANET-AVILES: FANTASTIC. YES, WE'LL  
10 BE THERE.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. I THINK WITH  
12 THAT --

13 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, LARRY, AND  
14 THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR THE FEEDBACK. VERY  
15 USEFUL.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. I THINK WITH  
17 THAT, WE CAN ADJOURN AND SEE YOU ALL SOON WITH  
18 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

19 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 3:13  
20 P.M.)

21  
22  
23  
24  
25

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

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 VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND MEDICINE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JULY 17, 2023, 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