

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

BEFORE THE
APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF 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 25, 2024
9 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2024-31

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

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS (CLIN 1 OR 2)	3
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS (INFR6.1 AND INFR6.2)	13
CLOSED SESSION	NONE
5. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEMS 3 & 4 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)).	
OPEN SESSION	
6. GENERAL COMMENTS ON ARS PROCESS	NONE
7. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
8. ADJOURNMENT	51

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

JULY 25, 2024; 9 A.M.

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GOOD MORNING,
EVERYONE. WELCOME TO THE 64TH MEETING OF THE
APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. WE'RE CALLING --
WE ARE HERE IN HEADQUARTERS HERE IN SOUTH SAN
FRANCISCO, AND THE REST OF YOU ARE SPREAD ALL OVER
THE STATE. I'M WELCOMING YOU. WE'RE GOING TO
CONSIDER APPLICATIONS IN BOTH CLINICAL AND
INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS TODAY. I'M GOING TO START
THE MEETING WITH ASKING SCOTT TOCHER TO CALL THE
ROLL.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. TOCHER: DAN BERNAL.
2 MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.
3 MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.
4 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.
5 MR. TOCHER: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
6 CLARK-HARVEY.
7 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: PRESENT.
8 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. YSABEL
9 DURON. MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
10 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
11 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.
12 DR. FISHER: PRESENT.
13 MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS. DAVID
14 HIGGINS.
15 DR. HIGGINS: PRESENT.
16 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HERE.
18 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.
19 MR. LAJARA: PRESENT.
20 MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
21 DR. MIASKOWSKI: PRESENT.
22 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
23 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
24 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
25 DR. PADILLA: HERE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA. MARVIN
2 SOUTHARD.

3 DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.

4 MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON. KEVIN XU.

5 DR. XU: HERE.

6 MR. TOCHER: GREAT. THANKS VERY MUCH.
7 AND WE HAVE A QUORUM.

8 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: WE DO. THANK YOU,
9 SCOTT.

10 SO WE'LL START WITH THE CONSIDERATION OF
11 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE SUBMITTED TO OUR CLINICAL
12 TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS, CLIN1 OR CLIN2. I'M GOING TO
13 ASK GIL -- WHERE ARE YOU? -- DR. GIL SAMBRANO.

14 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. SO HAYLEY LAM IS
15 GOING TO BE PRESENTING THIS ONE.

16 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. HAYLEY,
17 WHERE ARE YOU?

18 DR. LAM: I'M HERE. GIVE ME A MOMENT HERE
19 TO SHARE MY SLIDES.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU.

21 DR. LAM: CAN FOLKS SEE THAT?

22 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PERFECT.

23 DR. LAM: GOOD MORNING, FOLKS. I'M HERE,
24 AS VITO SAID, TO PRESENT THE CLINICAL APPLICATION
25 FOR THE COMMITTEE TODAY. AS ALWAYS, WE BEGIN WITH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE MISSION: ACCELERATING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO
2 DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
3 TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE
4 CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE CLINICAL BUDGET STATUS IS BRIGHT,
2 SHINY, ANY NEW FROM YOUR APPROVALS LAST MONTH. THE
3 ALLOCATION FOR THE CLINICAL BUDGET IS A 145.5
4 MILLION. AND TODAY BEFORE YOU IS THE VERY FIRST
5 REQUEST FOR THIS COMMITTEE OF JUST UNDER 8 MILLION,
6 WHICH WE'VE ROUNDED HERE TO EIGHT FOR SIMPLICITY'S
7 SAKE, WITH NOTHING APPROVED YET.

8 THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE
9 CLINICAL PROGRAM, AS ALWAYS, IS A SCORE OF A 1, 2,
10 OR 3. A 1 IS A RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING. IT MAY
11 HAVE MINOR THINGS THAT CAN BE RESOLVED DURING
12 CONTRACTING AND DURING THE COURSE OF THE AWARD. A
13 SCORE OF 2 IS A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE COMMITTEE
14 THAT THE APPLICATION CANNOT BE FUNDED AT THIS TIME,
15 BUT HAS ADDRESSABLE CHANGES OR ADDITIONAL
16 CLARIFICATIONS THAT CAN ALLOW THE APPLICATION TO BE
17 RESUBMITTED. A SCORE OF 3 IS A DO NOT RECOMMEND FOR
18 FUNDING FROM THE COMMITTEE, AND THE APPLICATION
19 CANNOT COME BACK FOR THE NEXT SIX MONTHS.

20 AND, AGAIN, ALL THE APPLICATIONS ARE
21 SCORED BY THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS
22 WORKING GROUP WITHOUT CONFLICT. THEY ARRIVE AT THE
23 SCORE WITH THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA, WHICH ARE
24 THESE FIVE. DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY
25 SIGNIFICANCE OR POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? IS THE

1 RATIONALE SOUND? IS THE PROJECT WELL PLANNED AND
2 DESIGNED? IS THE PROJECT FEASIBLE? AND DOES THE
3 PROJECT UPHOLD PRINCIPLES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
4 INCLUSION?

5 IN ADDITION TO THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING, WE
6 ALSO IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAM HAVE THE DIVERSITY,
7 EQUITY, AND INCLUSION SCORING BY THE BOARD MEMBERS
8 THAT SIT ON THE COMMITTEE. THE DEI SCORING IS ON A
9 SCALE OF ZERO TO TEN, TEN BEING THE BEST AS OUTLINED
10 BELOW. AND WE HAVE OUR RUBRIC THAT'S POSTED ON THE
11 WEBSITE. AGAIN, HERE THE DEI SCORING IS SIMILARLY
12 SCORED BY ALL BOARD MEMBERS WITH NO CONFLICTS.

13 THE COMPOSITION OF THE GRANTS WORKING
14 GROUP IS COMPOSED OF UP TO 15 SCIENTIFIC GRANTS
15 WORKING GROUP MEMBERS THAT EVALUATE, THERE ARE
16 DISEASE AREA EXPERTS, REGULATORY, MANUFACTURING,
17 PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT, AND THEY PROVIDE SCIENTIFIC
18 SCORES ON ALL APPLICATIONS. WE HAVE BOARD MEMBERS
19 THAT SIT ON THE PANEL AS WELL AND PROVIDE DEI
20 EVALUATION AND A PATIENT PERSPECTIVE ON THE PROGRAMS
21 AND APPLICATIONS. THEY PROVIDE A DEI SCORE ON ALL
22 APPLICATIONS AND ARE WELCOME TO PROVIDE SUGGESTED
23 SCIENTIFIC SCORES AS THEY ARE INTERESTED AND
24 COMFORTABLE. AND IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAMS, WE ALSO
25 HAVE SCIENTIFIC SPECIALISTS THAT ARE NON-VOTING

1 EXPERTS THAT ARE BROUGHT IN TO FILL IN EXPERTISE AS
2 NEEDED ON INDIVIDUAL APPLICATIONS, AND THEY PROVIDE
3 INITIAL SCORES, BUT DO NOT SUBMIT FINAL SCORES THAT
4 YOU SEE BEFORE YOU TODAY.

5 SO TODAY FOR THE APPLICATION UNDER
6 CONSIDERATION THERE'S ONE CONFLICT WITH THE ARS
7 COMMITTEE. I BELIEVE YSABEL IS NOT HERE TO DAY SO I
8 THINK THAT'S ALL RIGHT.

9 SO MOVING ON TO THE APPLICATION,
10 CLIN2-15901. SO THIS IS AN AUTOLOGOUS BCMA CAR-T
11 CELLS FOR THE TREATMENT OF RELAPSED REFRACTORY LIGHT
12 CHAIN AMYLOIDOSIS. AGAIN, AS DESCRIBED IN THE
13 TITLE, THIS THERAPY IS AN AUTOLOGOUS BCMA CAR-T
14 CELLS FOR THE INDICATION OF THE AMYLOID LIGHT CHAIN
15 AMYLOIDOSIS. THE GOAL IS A PHASE 1B TRIAL
16 COMPLETED, AND THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE JUST UNDER 8
17 MILLION WITH OVER 5 MILLION IN CO-FUNDING FROM THE
18 APPLICANT ORGANIZATION. THIS APPLICATIONS REQUIRES
19 A 40-PERCENT CO-FUNDING AND, THIS IS A CALIFORNIA
20 APPLICANT.

21 A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON
22 THIS PROJECT. SO THE CLINICAL BACKGROUND ON THIS,
23 THE DISEASE IS A RARE PLASMA CELL DISORDER WHERE
24 BASICALLY THE IMMUNE SYSTEM PROTEIN, THE LIGHT
25 CHAIN, IS OVERPRODUCED AND ACCUMULATES IN VARIOUS

1 ORGANS IN THE BODY. NAMELY, THE MOST COMMON ONES
2 BEING THE HEART, THE KIDNEYS, OR IN THIS CASE
3 PERIFERAL NERVOUS SYSTEM.

4 SO THE ACCUMULATION OF THESE ABNORMAL
5 PROTEINS BUILDS UP SLOWLY OVER TIME, AND IT CAN LEAD
6 TO MULTI-ORGAN FAILURE AND DEATH IN THE LONG TERM.
7 IN THE UNITED STATES CLOSE TO 4,000 PEOPLE ARE
8 DIAGNOSED EVERY YEAR, AND AFRICAN-AMERICANS HAVE A
9 TWOFOOLD HIGHER RATE OF OCCURRENCE AS COMPARED TO
10 WHITES.

11 SO THE PROPOSED THERAPY, RIGHT NOW THERE'S
12 NO CURES FOR THIS DISEASE. THE CURRENT STANDARD OF
13 CARE IS AN ANTIBODY THERAPY WITH CHEMO AND USUALLY
14 RESULTS IN PROGRESSION OF THE DISEASE OVER TIME.
15 THE PROPOSED THERAPY TARGETS AND DESTROYS THE
16 ABNORMAL PLASMA CELLS AND IS INTENDED TO BE A
17 ONE-TIME TREATMENT AS OPPOSED TO THE CURRENT
18 STANDARD OF CARE, WHICH IS POTENTIALLY REPEAT
19 TREATMENTS.

20 AND HOW IT'S RELEVANT TO CIRM IS THAT THE
21 THERAPY ITSELF IS GENETICALLY MODIFIED AUTOLOGOUS
22 IMMUNE CELLS.

23 IN TERMS OF SIMILAR CIRM PORTFOLIO
24 PROJECTS, CIRM CURRENTLY DOES NOT HAVE ANY ACTIVE
25 TRAN OR CLINICAL AWARDS ADDRESSING THIS INDICATION.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND THE APPLICANT TEAM DOES NOT HAVE ANY PRIOR CIRM
2 AWARDS.

3 SO FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION TODAY, THE
4 APPLICATION RECOMMENDATION FROM THE GRANTS WORKING
5 GROUP WAS A UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING
6 WITH 14 VOTES FOR A SCORE OF 1. THE DEI SCORE WAS A
7 SCORE OF 7. AND THE CIRM TEAM IS RECOMMENDING THAT
8 WE FUND THIS APPLICATION FOR THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF
9 JUST UNDER 8 MILLION HERE.

10 I'LL TURN IT BACK TO THE CHAIR. THANK
11 YOU.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, HAYLEY,
13 FOR A GREAT PRESENTATION. SO WE HAVE BEFORE US ONE
14 APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION. I'D LIKE TO
15 ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO FUND THE RECOMMENDATION TO
16 LAUNCH THE DISCUSSION.

17 DR. SOUTHARD: MOVE.

18 DR. MIASKOWSKI: SECOND. CHRIS.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. AND
20 THANK YOU FOR SELF-IDENTIFYING. MAKES IT EASY FOR
21 TRANSCRIBING. SO DISCUSSION ON THIS APPLICATION
22 FROM BOARD MEMBERS? AND DO WE HAVE ANY MEMBER OF
23 THE PUBLIC THAT WANTS TO SPEAK ON THIS?

24 MS. MANDAC: THERE ARE NO HANDS RAISED.

25 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: NO HANDS ARE RAISED.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OKAY. ONE LAST CALL FOR COMMENTS FROM ANY BOARD
2 MEMBER ON THIS BEFORE WE PROCEED TO A ROLL CALL
3 VOTE? OKAY. THANK YOU, SCOTT.

4 MR. TOCHER: SO THE MOTION IS TO FUND
5 CLIN2-15901.

6 DAN BERNAL.

7 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

8 MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.

9 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.

10 MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.

11 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.

12 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE. I'LL
13 COME BACK TO MARK.

14 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.

15 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.

16 DR. FISHER: YES.

17 MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.

18 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

19 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.

21 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.

22 MR. LAJARA: YES.

23 MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

24 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.

25 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
2 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
3 DR. PADILLA: YES.
4 MR. TOCHER: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
5 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
6 MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.
7 DR. XU: YES.
8 MR. TOCHER: GREAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
9 THE CHAIR. MOTION CARRIES.
10 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MOTION CARRIES.
11 THANK YOU. THANK YOU, EVERYONE.
12 MOVING TO THE NEXT AGENDA ITEM, IT'S TO
13 CONSIDER THE GREATER NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS THAT
14 HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO TWO
15 INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS, INFRASTRUCTURE 6.1 AND 6.2.
16 AND THIS TIME I WON'T BE MISTAKEN IN ASKING GIL TO
17 TAKE OVER THE PRESENTATION.
18 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
19 SO GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. I'M GOING TO PRESENT THE
20 OUTCOMES OF BOTH GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND FACILITIES
21 WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE SHARED
22 RESOURCE LABORATORIES. AND SO THESE ARE GOING TO BE
23 RELATED TO RESUBMISSIONS THAT WERE MADE. YOU MAY
24 RECALL THAT BACK IN FEBRUARY WE REVIEWED AND
25 APPROVED SOME APPLICATIONS, BUT THIS IS FOR

1 REVISIONS, AND I'LL GO THROUGH ALL OF THAT.

2 AGAIN, STARTING WITH OUR MISSION, TO
3 ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER
4 TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN
5 AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND
6 WORLD. IT'S WHY WE'RE HERE AND THAT IS A CRITICAL
7 PART OF THIS PROGRAM AS WELL.

8 I'M JUST GOING TO GIVE YOU A VERY BRIEF
9 REMINDER OF WHAT THE SHARED RESOURCE LABS PROGRAMS
10 INTENDS TO DO. ITS OVERALL PURPOSE IS TO PROVIDE
11 SEVERAL FUNCTIONS ONCE THEY ARE ESTABLISHED. IT IS
12 TO PROVIDE RESEARCH LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY, MEANING
13 WITHIN THE INSTITUTION THAT PROVIDES IT, BUT THEN
14 ALSO MORE BROADLY TO NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS,
15 COMPANIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS THAT COULD
16 BENEFIT IN ORDER TO HAVE CELL CULTURE FACILITIES TO
17 CONDUCT STEM CELL BASED-MODELING EXPERIMENTS AND
18 OTHER HIGHLY SPECIALIZED TECHNOLOGY THAT COME FROM
19 THOSE LABORATORIES TO PROVIDE ALSO
20 WELL-CHARACTERIZED UNMODIFIED AND MODIFIED HUMAN
21 PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL COLLECTIONS, STEM CELL-BASED
22 MODELS, AND PROVIDE TRAINING TO THOSE WHO WANT TO
23 USE THEM ON HOW TO USE THESE AND THE FACILITIES AND
24 SPACE TO DO IT.

25 IT IS ALSO TO PROVIDE EDUCATORS A FORMAL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TECHNIQUES COURSE FOR STUDENT EDUCATION. SO A GOOD
2 EXAMPLE OF THIS IS FOR THE BRIDGES PROGRAM. THE
3 BRIDGES STUDENTS OFTEN UTILIZE THE SHARED LABORATORY
4 TECHNIQUES COURSE PROGRAM AS PART OF THEIR TRAINING
5 WHEN THEY ENTER A LABORATORY.

6 WE ALSO AS PART OF THIS PROGRAM WANT EACH
7 OF THEM TO IMPLEMENT A SUSTAINABILITY PLAN. AND
8 THIS IS IMPORTANT SO THAT THE SERVICES, ONCE
9 ESTABLISHED, CAN CONTINUE EVEN AFTER CIRM HAS ENDED
10 THE AWARD. WE WANT THESE TO BE ONGOING PROGRAMS.

11 A REMINDER THAT THE PROGRAM WAS DIVIDED
12 INTO TWO DIFFERENT TYPES OF SHARED RESOURCE LABS.
13 WE HAVE THE 6.1, ESTABLISHING SRL'S. AND THESE WERE
14 LABORATORIES THAT PROVIDE AN AWARD OF 5.4 MILLION
15 AND IS INTENDED FOR THOSE THAT WILL EXPAND THE
16 GEOGRAPHIC ACCESS TO MODELS AND ESTABLISH AND HAVE
17 THE CAPABILITY TO ESTABLISH THESE IN THEIR LOCATION
18 AND HOPEFULLY PROVIDE A SCIENTIST IN THE AREA NEW
19 OPPORTUNITIES TO WORK WITH THESE.

20 SO BECAUSE THESE ARE ESTABLISHING SRL'S,
21 WE ARE PROVIDING FUNDING TO RENOVATE FACILITIES IN
22 ORDER FOR THEM TO ESTABLISH THESE LABS AS WELL AS
23 EQUIPMENT AND OPERATIONS FUNDING. AND WE ARE NOT
24 REQUIRING ANY CO-FUNDING.

25 ON THE OTHER HAND, THE 6.2 PROGRAM, WHICH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IS FOR ENHANCING OR EXPANSION SRL'S, IS FOCUSED ON
2 THOSE PROGRAMS THAT ALREADY HAVE EITHER AN
3 ESTABLISHED LAB PERHAPS THAT WAS INITIALLY FUNDED BY
4 CIRM AT SOME POINT OR THAT THEY HAVE ESTABLISHED
5 THEMSELVES. IT PROVIDES 4.3 MILLION FOR THEM TO
6 DEVELOP CUTTING-EDGE STEM CELL-BASED MODELING
7 EXPERTISE. IT PROVIDES FUNDS FOR EQUIPMENT AND
8 OPERATIONS. AND THERE IS A REQUIRED 20-PERCENT
9 OPERATIONAL CO-FUNDING FOR THIS PROGRAM.

10 OVERALL FOR BOTH OF THESE TYPES OF SRL'S
11 THE PROGRAM BUDGET IS 50 MILLION TOTAL THAT WAS
12 ALLOCATED.

13 THE APPLICATIONS FOR THESE REVISIONS WERE
14 REVIEWED BY TWO DIFFERENT GROUPS. IT WAS THE GRANTS
15 WORKING GROUP AS WELL AS THE FACILITIES WORKING
16 GROUP. SO I'LL JUST GO VERY BRIEFLY THROUGH THE
17 COMPOSITION OF BOTH.

18 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, WHICH YOU'RE
19 MORE FAMILIAR WITH, HAS 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS THAT
20 PERFORM THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF THESE PROGRAMS.
21 WE ALSO HAVE OUR SEVEN BOARD MEMBERS WHO
22 PARTICIPATE, PATIENT ADVOCATE OR NURSE MEMBERS, THAT
23 PROVIDE PERSPECTIVE ON DEI, SIGNIFICANCE AND
24 POTENTIAL FOR THE PROJECT, AND THEY ALSO PROVIDE
25 OVERSIGHT ON THE PROCESS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FOR THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, WE HAVE
2 FOUR REAL ESTATE EXPERTS THAT PROVIDE THEIR EXPERT
3 EVALUATION ON THE FACILITIES COMPONENTS. AND,
4 AGAIN, WE HAVE BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE PART OF THIS
5 GROUP OF WHICH WE HAVE, AGAIN, SEVEN BOARD MEMBERS
6 INCLUDING THE BOARD CHAIR.

7 BOTH GROUPS USE THE SAME SCORING SYSTEM OF
8 1, 2, OR 3 TO ASSIGN MERIT TO THESE APPLICATIONS,
9 WITH A SCORE OF 1 BEING EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND
10 WARRANTS FUNDING. SCORE OF 2 MEANS IT NEEDS
11 IMPROVEMENT. SCORE OF 3, THAT IT'S SUFFICIENTLY
12 FLAWED. AND WHEN WE WENT THROUGH THESE REVISIONS,
13 THEY USED THE SAME SCORING SYSTEM THAT WAS USED.

14 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA, THIS IS
15 THE BASIS FOR THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE THAT WAS DESIGNED
16 BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, ARE BASED ON THESE FIVE
17 QUESTIONS. DOES THE PROJECT OFFER A SIGNIFICANT
18 VALUE PROPOSITION? IS IT WELL PLANNED AND DESIGNED?
19 IS IT FEASIBLE? IF THEY PROPOSE A STEM CELL
20 TECHNIQUES COURSE, IS THIS WELL DESIGNED? AND DOES
21 THE PROJECT UPHOLD THE PRINCIPLES OF DEI?

22 FOR THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, THEIR
23 SCORE WAS BASED ON THESE QUESTIONS. DOES THE
24 PROPOSED RENOVATION OR FACILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
25 SUPPORT THE APPLICANT'S CORE RESEARCH AND

1 EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES? ARE THE FACILITY
2 IMPROVEMENTS FEASIBLE AS PROPOSED? DOES IT INCLUDE
3 THE APPROPRIATE RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND LABORATORY
4 CONFIGURATION THAT SUPPORTS THOSE ACTIVITIES? ARE
5 THE RENOVATION FACILITY IMPROVEMENT COSTS
6 APPROPRIATE? AND DOES THE APPLICANT ENSURE DEI
7 GOALS FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION?

8 SO I'M GOING TO NOW, WITH THAT BACKGROUND,
9 REMIND YOU OF WHERE WE WERE BACK IN FEBRUARY WHEN WE
10 HAD THE INITIAL REVIEW. SO THE OUTCOME OF THAT
11 INITIAL REVIEW LED TO THIS WHERE WE HAD -- AND I'M
12 GOING TO SEPARATE THE 6.1 FROM THE 6.2 PROGRAM. SO
13 RIGHT NOW WE'RE LOOKING AT A TABLE WITH JUST THE
14 ESTABLISHING APPLICATIONS. AND SO WE HAD SIX OF
15 THOSE. AND AT THAT TIME WE HAD ONE APPLICATION THAT
16 HAD A FAVORABLE SCORE BY BOTH THE GRANTS WORKING
17 GROUP AND FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. AND SO OUR
18 RECOMMENDATION WAS TO FUND IT. AND SO THAT HAS
19 MOVED FORWARD AND IS IN THE PROCESS OF LAUNCHING.

20 WE HAD THE REMAINDER THAT HAD A SCORE OF 2
21 EITHER FROM THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP OR THE
22 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND SO THOSE WERE GIVEN THE
23 OPPORTUNITY TO REVISE THEIR APPLICATIONS AND
24 RESUBMIT THEM IN THE RESPECTIVE AREAS. WHERE THEY
25 HAD THE SCORE OF 1 THAT IS RETAINED FOR THE AREAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WHERE THEY DID WELL, BUT THE AREAS WHERE THEY NEEDED
2 IMPROVEMENT IS WHERE WE FOCUSED THEM ON THEIR
3 REVISIONS. SO WE ALLOWED THEM TO REVISE THAT.

4 FOR THE 6.2 PROGRAM, WE HAD MORE
5 APPLICATIONS. WE HAD A TOTAL OF 20 ALTOGETHER. AND
6 THERE WERE FOUR THAT WERE SCORING WITH A 1. AND SO
7 THOSE WERE APPROVED FOR FUNDING AND MOVED FORWARD.
8 THERE WERE SIX THAT RECEIVED A SCORE OF 2. SO THOSE
9 GOT THE OPPORTUNITY TO REVISE AND RESUBMIT. AND
10 THEN THERE WERE FOUR OTHERS THAT WERE NOT FUNDED.

11 ALL RIGHT. SO THAT'S WHERE WE LEFT OFF.
12 IN TERMS OF BUDGET, AS I MENTIONED, WE STARTED WITH
13 50 MILLION AS THE AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR THE PROGRAM
14 AS A WHOLE. WITH THE TWO TABLES THAT I JUST SHOWED
15 YOU, WE HAD ONE THAT WAS RECOMMENDED OUT OF THE 6.1
16 ESTABLISHING GROUP, AND THERE WERE FOUR THAT WERE
17 RECOMMENDED OUT OF THE 6.2 EXPANDING/ENHANCING
18 GROUP. SO THE TOTAL FROM THESE TWO WAS 21.3
19 MILLION. AND SO THAT WAS APPROVED. AND WE HAD A
20 BALANCE OF 28.6 THAT WOULD ALLOW SUPPORT OF SIX
21 ADDITIONAL AWARDS.

22 AND SO LET ME JUST SUMMARIZE WHERE WE ARE
23 IN TERMS OF THE APPLICATION STATUS. SO FOLLOWING
24 THAT INITIAL GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND FACILITIES
25 WORKING GROUP REVIEW, WE ALLOWED THOSE THAT RECEIVED

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 A SCORE OF 2 FROM EITHER GROUP TO REVISE THEIR
2 APPLICATIONS AND RESUBMIT. THERE WERE TWO
3 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE REVIEWED BY THE FACILITIES
4 WORKING GROUP AND NINE THAT WERE REVIEWED BY THE
5 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. SO A TOTAL OF 11.

6 AND AS I MENTIONED, THERE WOULD BE SIX OUT
7 OF THOSE 11 THAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO FUND WITH THE
8 REMAINING FUNDS.

9 THE FOCUS OF THE REVIEWS BY BOTH GROUPS
10 WAS TO EVALUATE AND SCORE THE RESUBMISSIONS. SO
11 THEY FOCUSED ON WHETHER OR NOT THE APPLICANTS
12 PROVIDED THE NEEDED CLARITY, ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
13 IN ORDER TO UPGRADE IT TO A SCORE OF 1 OR NOT. AND
14 SO WE WILL THEN GO OVER THE OUTCOME OF THAT.

15 SO NOW THIS IS THE OUTCOME OF THE REVIEW
16 BY THE WORKING GROUPS AS IT RELATES TO THE
17 RESUBMISSIONS. SO WE'RE LOOKING HERE ONLY AT THE
18 6.1 PROGRAM, THE FIVE APPLICATIONS THAT HAD A SCORE
19 OF 2 BY ONE OR THE OTHER GROUP. THE FIRST TWO ROWS
20 SHOW THE TWO APPLICATIONS THAT WERE REVIEWED BY THE
21 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP. ONE OF THESE RECEIVED A
22 SCORE OF 1, MEANING IT UPGRADED FROM A 2 TO A 1.
23 AND SO OUR RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THAT
24 APPLICATION. THERE WAS ONE THAT WAS DOWNGRADED TO A
25 3. AND SO WE DON'T RECOMMEND FUNDING FOR THAT ONE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP LOOKED AT THREE
2 OF THESE. AND SO THEY HAD TWO APPLICATIONS THAT
3 THEY UPGRADED TO A SCORE OF 1 AND ONE THAT WAS
4 DOWNGRADED TO A SCORE OF 3. AND SO OUR
5 RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THESE THREE OF THE 6.1
6 PROGRAM.

7 OKAY. I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU NOW THE 6.2
8 APPLICATIONS AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS THERE. HERE
9 FOR THE 6.2 PROGRAM, THERE IS NO FACILITIES WORKING
10 GROUP REVIEW. THAT'S NOT REQUIRED. THEY DON'T HAVE
11 RENOVATIONS. SO THAT'S NOT RELEVANT. ONLY THE
12 GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW WAS NECESSARY FOR THESE.

13 THERE WERE THREE APPLICATIONS HERE AS WELL
14 THAT UPGRADED TO A SCORE OF 1. AND THERE WERE THREE
15 OTHERS THAT REMAINED AT A 2 AND DID NOT MOVE
16 FORWARD.

17 OKAY. SO NOW WITH REGARDS TO THE BUDGET,
18 WE HAVE OUT OF 6.1 THREE APPLICATIONS THAT ARE
19 RECOMMENDED. SO THE TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED FROM
20 THESE THREE APPLICATIONS IS JUST OVER 15 MILLION.
21 OUT OF THE 6.2 I SHOWED YOU THREE APPLICATIONS THAT
22 UPGRADED TO A SCORE OF 1. THE TOTAL FOR THAT WAS
23 11.6 MILLION. THE GRAND TOTAL FROM ALL SIX IS 26.8
24 MILLION. AND IF YOU RECALL, WE HAD ABOUT 28.6
25 MILLION LEFT. SO THAT, BY CHANCE, FORTUNATELY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALIGNED VERY WELL WITH THE BUDGET THAT WAS
2 REMAINING. AND SO OUR BALANCE WOULD BE ONLY 1.8
3 MILLION, WHICH IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO FUND ANY OTHER
4 PROGRAMS. SO IT'S NICE WHEN IT WORKS THAT WAY.

5 SO FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF THESE
6 APPLICATIONS, I WANT TO REMIND YOU OF SOME CONFLICTS
7 OF INTEREST. AND SO IN THIS CASE, BECAUSE WE HAVE A
8 LIMITED NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS THAT CANNOT ALL BE
9 FUNDED, EVEN A CONFLICT WITH ONE APPLICATION WOULD
10 PREVENT ANY BOARD MEMBER FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE
11 DISCUSSION OF ALL OF THEM. SO THESE ARE THE BOARD
12 MEMBERS THAT HAVE A CONFLICT. SO PLEASE REFRAIN
13 FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE DISCUSSION.

14 AND I'M JUST GOING TO GO BACK TO THIS. I
15 DON'T KNOW OF THAT IS HELPFUL TO JUST KEEP THE SLIDE
16 HERE. AND I WILL TURN IT BACK OVER TO THE CHAIR.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, GIL,
18 ESPECIALLY FOR THE CLARITY OF THE PRESENTATION
19 BECAUSE, FOR REASONS THAT YOU VERY CLEARLY
20 ARTICULATED, THIS IS NOT OUR NORMAL, STRAIGHTFORWARD
21 CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS. AND BECAUSE OF THAT,
22 BOARD MEMBERS, IN A SENSE OF HONORING OR HUMORING
23 THE CHAIR, EVEN THOUGH THIS IS ONE AGENDA ITEM, I'M
24 WONDERING IF IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR CLARITY AND FOR
25 LOGISTICAL REASONS THAT WHEN YOU MAKE YOUR MOTION TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FUND OR NOT FUND, THAT WE SORT OF BREAK THIS LIST OF
2 APPLICATIONS IN HALF TO CONSIDER FIRST THE
3 INFRASTRUCTURE 6.1 APPLICATIONS, OF WHICH THERE ARE
4 FIVE. AND WHEN WE'VE SETTLED THAT MATTER, THEN TO
5 GO TO INFRASTRUCTURE 6.2, THE ENHANCING
6 APPLICATIONS. I DON'T THINK, IF WE WERE TO DO THAT,
7 IT WOULD DISADVANTAGE OR PREJUDICE ONE GROUP AGAINST
8 THE OTHER.

9 DR. FISHER: IT'S THREE APPLICATIONS IN
10 6.1, NOT FIVE.

11 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THAT IS A MOTION
12 FROM FRED.

13 MR. TOCHER: FRED, YOU ARE CORRECT. THE
14 TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS PENDING IS FIVE, THE
15 TOTAL RECOMMENDED IS THREE.

16 DR. FISHER: SO MOVED, 6.1.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: TO FUND THE THREE
18 APPLICATIONS IN 6.1. WE HAVE A MOTION FROM FRED.

19 DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.

20 MR. TOCHER: MARV SECONDED.

21 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MARV SECONDED.

22 OKAY.

23 MR. TOCHER: CAN I ASK, IS THE ADDITIONAL
24 PART OF THE MOTION TO NOT FUND THE REMAINING
25 APPLICATIONS IN 6.1?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. FISHER: THE MOTION IS TO FUND THE
2 APPLICATIONS THAT WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

3 MR. TOCHER: WE CAN TAKE UP THE SECOND
4 MOTION.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. LET'S DO
6 THAT THEN. THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR IS TO FUND THREE
7 INFRASTRUCTURE 6.1 APPLICATIONS: 15363, 15413,
8 15517. DISCUSSION ON THESE THREE APPLICATIONS FROM
9 BOARD MEMBERS? HEARING NO DISCUSSION, IS THERE ANY
10 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WHO WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT?

11 MS. MANDAC: THERE ARE NO HANDS RAISED.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THERE ARE NO HANDS
13 RAISED. I THINK WE CAN PROCEED TO A VOTE, SCOTT.

14 MR. TOCHER: FOR MEMBERS BONNEVILLE,
15 CLARK-HARVEY, AND FISCHER-COLBRIE, IF WHEN YOU
16 RESPOND, IF YOU COULD INDICATE EITHER AYE OR NAY
17 EXCEPT WITH RESPECT TO THOSE APPLICATIONS WITH WHICH
18 YOU HAVE A CONFLICT.

19 DAN BERNAL.

20 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

21 MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.

22 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
23 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

24 MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.

25 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

2 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

3 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

4 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

5 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
6 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.

8 DR. FISHER: YES.

9 MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.

10 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

11 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.

13 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.

14 MR. LAJARA: YES.

15 MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

16 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.

17 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.

18 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.

19 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.

20 DR. PADILLA: YES.

21 MR. TOCHER: MARVIN SOUTHARD.

22 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.

23 MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.

24 DR. XU: YES.

25 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU, KEVIN. AND THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MOTION CARRIES.

2 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GREAT. NOW WE NEED
3 TO COMPLETE THE SECTION. I NEED A MOTION FROM A
4 BOARD MEMBER NOT TO FUND THE TWO OTHER APPLICATIONS
5 IN THIS CATEGORY. AND THAT WOULD BE APPLICATION
6 INFRASTRUCTURE 6.1, 15366 AND 15478.

7 DR. DULIEGE: I MOVE.

8 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MOTION FROM
9 ANNE-MARIE. THANK YOU. AND THE SECOND?

10 DR. FISHER: FRED FISHER SECONDS.

11 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. ANY
12 DISCUSSION ON THESE TWO APPLICATIONS? AND IF NOT
13 FROM BOARD MEMBERS, ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WISHING
14 TO SPEAK?

15 MS. MANDAC: TWO HANDS RAISED. SO THE
16 FIRST ONE WILL BE DJURDYCA -- I'M SO SORRY ABOUT
17 THIS. I DO NOT KNOW HOW TO PRONOUNCE YOUR NAME --
18 LAST NAME C-O-S-S, COSS. AFTER THAT WILL BE
19 ISABELLA BAGDAS. DR. COSS, YOU WILL HAVE THREE
20 MINUTES. WE WILL KEEP TIME. AND THE CLOCK WILL
21 ALSO APPEAR ON YOUR SIDE OF THE ZOOM SCREEN. YOU
22 MAY START NOW.

23 DR. COSS: GOOD MORNING. I WOULD LIKE TO
24 DISCUSS APPLICATION 15366. I AM DJURDYCA COSS. I
25 AM ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR RESEARCH AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AT UC RIVERSIDE. AND THANK YOU
2 FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY.

3 OUR PROPOSAL, BIO-FORM, WAS NOT
4 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. AND WE HOPE THAT YOU WILL
5 REVIEW OUR PROPOSAL STRENGTHENED, WILL RECONSIDER IT
6 IN LIGHT OF OUR REGIONAL NEEDS. WITHOUT THIS
7 FUNDING, THE RESIDENTS OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INLAND
8 EMPIRE WILL BE DEPRIVED OF THE UP-TO-DATE STEM CELL
9 TRAINING REQUIRED FOR WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AND
10 SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION IN OUR VERY DIVERSE REGION.

11 PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING THREE
12 INTERRELATED POINTS. FIRST, UCR'S CURRENT CORE IS A
13 REGIONAL HUB FOR DISSEMINATION OF CUTTING-EDGE
14 METHODOLOGIES. OUR SCIENTIFIC PROPOSAL RECEIVED A
15 TIER I RANKING. BIO-FORM WOULD ENABLE UCR TO OFFER
16 TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT BRINGS ORGANOID CULTURES, 3D
17 PRINTING, AND NINE STEM CELL MINI CERTIFICATE
18 COURSES TO LABORATORIES IN THE INLAND EMPIRE. THESE
19 COURSES WOULD PREPARE THE REGION FOR THE NEXT
20 GENERATION OF STEM CELL RESEARCH AND INCREASE OUR
21 WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.

22 SECOND, UCR INTEGRATES DEI EFFORTS INTO
23 THE WORK OF INNOVATIVE SCIENCE. AS THE REGION'S
24 ONLY STEM CELL CORE, UCR IS VITAL TO THE PROJECT OF
25 ENSURING THE DEI EFFORTS, A PRIMARY COMPONENT OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 STEM CELL TRAINING. UCR'S STEM CELL PROGRAMS HAVE
2 EDUCATED NUMEROUS STUDENTS WHO WOULD OTHERWISE BE
3 UNDERSERVED. BIO-FORM WOULD EXPAND THE COURSE
4 WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT CAPABILITIES AND INCREASE THE
5 SUPPORT IT PROVIDES TO MANY OF OUR REGIONAL PARTNER
6 INSTITUTIONS.

7 THIRD, BIO-FORM WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE
8 FOUNDATION OF FUTURE SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION.
9 BIO-FORM'S INFRASTRUCTURE WOULD EXPAND THE SCOPE OF
10 THE EXTRAMURAL FUNDING FOR WHICH UCR COULD APPLY.
11 AND THIS WOULD HAVE ADDITIONAL EFFECTS ON BOTH
12 SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION AND DEI TRAINING. BY
13 CONTRAST, WITHOUT THIS FUNDING, UCR'S STEM CELL CORE
14 MAY NEED TO CLOSE, MEANING THE REGION WOULD LOSE A
15 VITAL INNOVATION AND TRAINING HUB.

16 IF CIRM FUNDING DOES BECOME AVAILABLE,
17 UCR'S TEAM IS FULLY CAPABLE OF RENOVATING AND
18 SUSTAINING THIS PROJECT. THIS IS DEMONSTRATED BY
19 THE EXCELLENT CONSTRUCTION OF OUR CURRENT STEM CELL
20 CORE.

21 MS. MANDAC: THANK YOU SO MUCH, PROFESSOR
22 COSS. THE TIME IS UP.

23 THE NEXT SPEAKER WILL BE ISABELLA BAGDAS.
24 YOU WILL HAVE THREE MINUTES. THE CLOCK SHOULD
25 APPEAR ON THE TOP RIGHT OF YOUR ZOOM SCREEN.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. BAGDAS: HELLO. THANK YOU FOR
2 ALLOWING ME TO SPEAK TODAY ON APPLICATION 15366. I
3 AM HERE TO URGE YOU TO CONSIDER FUNDING THE
4 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SHARED RESEARCH AND TRAINING
5 FACILITY AT UC RIVERSIDE. I'M A BIOENGINEERING
6 PH.D. CANDIDATE AT UC RIVERSIDE, AND I AM FORTUNATE
7 ENOUGH TO BE FUNDED THROUGH THE CIRM SCHOLAR'S
8 PROGRAMS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS.

9 WITH THIS FUNDING I HAVE BEEN WORKING
10 TOWARD ENGINEERING A 3D MUSCLE MODEL FROM
11 PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS. MY RESEARCH IN THE ORGANOID
12 FIELD HAS PROVIDED ME WITH AN APPRECIATION FOR HOW
13 INVOLVED DEVELOPING 3D STEM CELL-BASED MODELS CAN
14 BE. TECHNIQUES THAT MAY BE SIMPLE IN 2D CULTURE
15 PRESENT NEW AND UNIQUE CHALLENGES IN COMPLEX
16 ENGINEERED TISSUES. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
17 BIO-FORM CORE AT UC RIVERSIDE WILL HELP TO ALLEVIATE
18 THESE CHALLENGES WHILE TRAINING THE NEXT GENERATION
19 OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS.

20 THE BIO-FORM CORE WOULD EXPAND AN EXISTING
21 SUCCESSFUL STEM CELL RESEARCH CENTER THAT'S
22 PREVIOUSLY BEEN FUNDED BY CIRM BY BRINGING CRUCIAL
23 INSTRUMENTATION, LIKE BIOPRINTING, TO THE
24 UNDERSERVED INLAND EMPIRE REGION. CURRENTLY THE
25 NEAREST BIOPRINTER IS 60 MILES AWAY THROUGH SOUTHERN

1 CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC. THIS IS A MAJOR BARRIER TO UC
2 RIVERSIDE AND THE FIVE OTHER INLAND EMPIRE
3 UNIVERSITIES WHO RELY ON THE STEM CELL CORE.

4 THE INLAND EMPIRE IS GEOGRAPHICALLY
5 ISOLATED AND HISTORICALLY UNDERSERVED ECONOMICALLY,
6 EDUCATIONALLY, AND MEDICALLY. RAPID ESTABLISHMENT
7 OF THE BIO-FORM CORE IS CRITICAL IF WE WISH TO
8 EMPOWER DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS IN
9 THE INLAND EMPIRE. THE PROPOSED BIO-FORM PROGRAM
10 WILL EXPAND THE REGION'S STEM CELL EXPERTISE TO
11 INCLUDE CREATING COMPLEX STEM CELL-BASED 3D MODELS
12 OF ORGANOID, TISSUES, AND ORGANS FOR REGENERATION
13 THERAPIES. THESE APPROACHES REPRESENT THE FOREFRONT
14 OF STEM CELL RESEARCH AND ARE A COMPLEMENTARY BLEND
15 OF BASIC STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND BIOENGINEERING.

16 AS A LIFELONG RESIDENT OF THE INLAND
17 EMPIRE, I HAVE CONTINUOUSLY WITNESSED THE UNIVERSITY
18 EXPAND AND INNOVATE. MOST IMPORTANTLY, THOUGH, THE
19 STEM CELL CORE HAS REMAINED AN ESSENTIAL RESOURCE IN
20 RECRUITING AND TRAINING SCIENTISTS FROM HISTORICALLY
21 UNDERREPRESENTED COMMUNITIES. THE BIO-FORM CORE
22 WILL EXPAND THIS PROGRESS BY PROVIDING A DIVERSE
23 GROUP OF RESEARCHERS FROM THE ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED
24 INLAND EMPIRE WITH THE PLATFORMS NEEDED FOR ADVANCED
25 3D ORGAN ENGINEERING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THROUGH WORKING WITH THE INLAND EMPIRE
2 STUDENTS FROM THE CIRM SPARKS PROGRAM, THROUGH
3 BRIDGES, I HAVE OBSERVED THAT THEY OFTEN DO NOT HAVE
4 ROBUST ACCESS TO THE INSTRUMENTATION NEEDED FOR 3D
5 CULTURE MODELS AT THEIR HOME CAMPUSES. EXPEDITING
6 THE FORMATION OF THE BIO-FORM CORE IS VITAL TO
7 EMPOWERING THIS DIVERSE GROUP OF RESEARCHERS.

8 THE BIO-FORM CORE TRAINING PROGRAM
9 ADDRESSES A CRITICALLY UNMET NEED FOR THE INLAND
10 EMPIRE, ULTIMATELY REDUCING THE BARRIERS TO ENTRY
11 FOR SCIENTISTS AT EVERY EDUCATION LEVEL WHO WISH TO
12 DEVELOP 3D MODELS OF ORGANOIDs, TISSUES, AND ORGANS.
13 I IMPORE YOU TO CONSIDER FUNDING THE BIO-FORM CORE
14 AND HELP TO ESTABLISH THE INLAND EMPIRE REGION AS
15 ONE OF SCIENTIFIC INNOVATION. THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: IF THERE ARE NO
17 OTHER COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS OR THE MEMBERS OF
18 THE PUBLIC, WE'LL PROCEED TO A VOTE ON THIS SECOND
19 MOTION HERE.

20 DR. DULIEGE: ACTUALLY I'M SORRY BECAUSE
21 IT'S HARD FOR ME TO MANAGE FROM FAR AWAY. I DON'T
22 HAVE A COMMENT, BUT, OF COURSE, I'M GOING TO ASK --
23 THIS IS ANNE-MARIE -- GIL IF HE CAN RESPOND TO THE
24 TWO COMMENTS THAT WERE JUST MADE ABOUT THE UC
25 RIVERSIDE PROGRAM AND PROVIDE YOUR PERSPECTIVE ON

1 THIS.

2 DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. I WILL DO MY BEST TO
3 DO SO. I MEAN I THINK THE POINTS BROUGHT UP BY THE
4 MEMBERS THAT RELATE TO THE INLAND EMPIRE AND THE
5 NEED TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN A PRESENCE THERE I
6 THINK IS IMPORTANT. WE DID SUPPORT A SHARED LAB IN
7 THE PAST THAT HAS CONTINUED TO EXIST WITHOUT OUR
8 FUNDING BECAUSE WE DID ACTUALLY STOP THE SHARED LAB
9 FUNDING SEVERAL YEARS AGO. SO WE'RE GLAD TO KNOW
10 THAT IT HAS CONTINUED DESPITE NOT HAVING HAD
11 CONTINUED FUNDING FROM US.

12 THE ONLY OTHER THING I CAN SAY IS THAT
13 THIS PROGRAM WAS REVIEWED BY THE FACILITIES WORKING
14 GROUP BECAUSE THAT'S THE AREA WHERE THEY NEEDED
15 IMPROVEMENT. UNFORTUNATELY THE FACILITIES WORKING
16 GROUP WAS QUITE DISAPPOINTED WITH THE PROPOSAL.
17 THEY FELT THERE WAS A LOT OF ELEMENTS THAT WERE
18 MISSING IN THE APPLICATION THAT WOULD ALLOW THEM TO
19 FEEL COMFORTABLE MOVING FORWARD WITH THIS.

20 THEY FELT THAT THE TIMELINE AND A LOT OF
21 THE ELEMENTS THAT WOULD GIVE THEM SOME LEVEL OF
22 COMFORT THAT THEY COULD DO THIS WAS NOT REALLY
23 THERE.

24 SO I THINK BOTH THE FACILITIES WORKING
25 GROUP AND THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP DID STRIVE TO

1 LOOK AT THESE APPLICATIONS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF
2 THESE ARE AREAS THAT ARE UNDERSERVED AND WOULD
3 GREATLY BENEFIT FROM HAVING THESE LABORATORIES
4 ESTABLISHED OR CONTINUE TO FUNCTION HERE. SO THAT
5 IS CERTAINLY SOMETHING THAT WE AGREE WITH, AND I
6 THINK THE WORKING GROUPS AGREED WITH. BUT I THINK
7 WHEN IT COMES DOWN TO LOOKING, THEN, AT THE
8 APPLICATION AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THOSE APPLICATIONS
9 IS WHERE THEY FOUND THAT THEY WERE LACKING AND DID
10 NOT FEEL COMFORTABLE MOVING FORWARD WITH IT.

11 DR. DULIEGE: A QUICK RESPONSE. I KNOW I
12 SEE MORE WITH YOUR HANDS UP. THANK YOU, GIL. AS
13 ALWAYS, YOUR RESPONSE IS VERY INFORMATIVE. ON ONE
14 HAND, YOU KNOW HOW I'M ALWAYS FOLLOWING THE
15 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE VARIOUS WORKING GROUPS, BUT
16 WHEN TWO PEOPLE COME AND WANT TO EXPLAIN WHY THEY
17 HAVE A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE ON IT, IT'S WORTH
18 HAVING YOUR PERSPECTIVE.

19 SO THEN MY QUESTION IS IF THEY WERE TO
20 REAPPLY, DO THEY HAVE A CHANCE TO REAPPLY AND
21 PROVIDE A BETTER PROPOSAL THAN THE ONE THAT THEY
22 DID, IN WHICH CASE IT COULD BE RECONSIDERED, OR IS
23 SO FAR OUR NO IS A FINAL NO FOR THIS?

24 DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH. UNFORTUNATELY, AT
25 LEAST FOR NOW, IT WOULD BE A FINAL NO BECAUSE WE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WOULD BE UTILIZING UP OUR BUDGET. AND THERE IS NO
2 PLAN AT THE MOMENT TO HAVE ANOTHER ADDITION OF THE
3 SHARED LAB PROGRAM EMERGE. IT DOESN'T MEAN IT CAN'T
4 OR THAT IT WOULDN'T, BUT AT LEAST AT THIS TIME WE
5 DON'T HAVE ANY PLANS SPECIFICALLY TO ESTABLISH
6 ADDITIONAL LABORATORIES.

7 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

8 DR. SOUTHARD: I JUST WANTED TO ADD THAT
9 THE REASON IT WENT FROM A 1 TO A 3 IS NOT BECAUSE
10 THE PROPOSAL WAS TERRIBLE, BUT BECAUSE THERE WAS NO
11 MONEY LEFT. SO THERE WAS NO SENSE IN GIVING THEM A
12 2 TO RESUBMIT AND WASTE TIME FOR NO MONEY.

13 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU.

14 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I THINK WE HAVE
15 ANOTHER MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, A
16 NEW MEMBER.

17 MS. MANDAC: YES. PROFESSOR MARTIN
18 GARCIA-CASTRO. YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES.

19 DR. GARCIA-CASTRO: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
20 I REALLY APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY. I JUST WANT TO
21 MAKE TWO QUICK POINTS. FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THAT
22 IT'S CLEAR THAT OUR APPLICATION RECEIVED TOP SCORES
23 FROM THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BOARD, ACKNOWLEDGING THE
24 VALUE OF IT. AND ONE OF THE FIVE CRITERIA THAT WAS
25 USED IS FEASIBILITY AND DESIGN. AND THAT RECEIVED A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PERFECT SCORE WITH 14 OUT OF 14 VOTES.

2 THE SECOND POINT THAT I WANT TO MAKE IS
3 THAT, WHILE I AGREE WITH THE OUTCOME OF THE
4 FACILITIES REVIEW THAT WAS A 3 SCORE, I JUST WANT TO
5 ACKNOWLEDGE THAT OUR UNIVERSITY APPEARS TO NOT HAVE
6 THE SAME RESOURCES TO PROVIDE THE APPLICATION THAT
7 WOULD HAVE SEEN BETTER EYES. WE TRIED, WE DID OUR
8 BEST TO ANSWER THE REQUEST, AND WE CANNOT COMPETE.
9 AND I WANT YOU TO APPRECIATE THE DIFFICULTIES TO
10 CONVEY OUR MISSION OF EQUITY FROM CIRM OR FROM THE
11 BROADER CALIFORNIA WHEN WE DON'T RECOGNIZE THE FLAWS
12 IN THE SYSTEM THAT WILL PLAY AGAINST THOSE THAT HAVE
13 LESS RESOURCES. I THINK WE'VE DONE A GREAT JOB
14 SCIENTIFICALLY, AS RECOGNIZED BY THAT SCORE. AND WE
15 THINK THAT OUR APPLICATION COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER
16 HAD WE HAD MORE RESOURCES TO PUT INTO IT TO PROVIDE
17 ALL THE DETAILS THAT WERE NECESSARY. PERHAPS THIS
18 APPLICATION WOULD HAVE BEEN SEEN WITH BETTER EYES.

19 BECAUSE OF THAT, I MAKE THE SAME PLEDGE
20 THAT THE OTHER TWO PEOPLE. AND I ASK ONE OF THE
21 COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO RESCUE AND REEVALUATE THE VALUE
22 THAT THIS PROPOSAL HAS FOR THE REGION FOR ITS
23 SCIENTIFIC MERIT AND FOR THE CONTRIBUTION THAT WE DO
24 TO CIRM AND TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CALIFORNIA. THANK
25 YOU VERY MUCH.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU,
2 PROFESSOR. I'M GOING TO ASK SCOTT TO PROCEED TO A
3 ROLL CALL VOTE.

4 MR. TOCHER: OKAY. THIS IS NOT TO FUND
5 THE REMAINING TWO APPLICATIONS, 15366 AND 15478.
6 AGAIN, THE SAME REQUEST OF MEMBERS BONNEVILLE,
7 CLARK-HARVEY, AND FISCHER-COLBRIE.

8 DAN BERNAL.

9 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

10 MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.

11 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
12 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

13 MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.

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

16 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

17 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

18 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

19 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
20 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

21 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.

22 DR. FISHER: YES.

23 MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.

24 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

25 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.

2 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.

3 MR. LAJARA: YES.

4 MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

5 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.

6 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN. I'LL
7 COME BACK.

8 ADRIANA PADILLA.

9 DR. PADILLA: YES.

10 MR. TOCHER: MARVIN SOUTHARD.

11 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.

12 MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.

13 DR. XU: YES.

14 MR. TOCHER: AND I'M JUST COMING BACK TO
15 LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN. STAND BY. WE MAY HAVE ENOUGH
16 VOTES. LET ME COUNT HERE. GREAT. WE DO.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: WE DO HAVE ENOUGH.

18 MR. TOCHER: MOTION CARRIES.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THE MOTION HAS
20 CARRIED. THANK YOU.

21 SO I'D LIKE NOW TO MOVE TO THE SIX
22 APPLICATIONS THAT ARE IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE 6.2.
23 THESE ARE PROPOSALS TO ENHANCE OR EXPAND EXISTING
24 LABORATORIES. I WOULD LIKE A MOTION, A SINGLE
25 MOTION THIS TIME. IT MIGHT BE MORE EXPEDITIOUS TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FUND THE THREE THAT WERE RECOMMENDED AND NOT TO FUND
2 THE THREE THAT WERE NOT RECOMMENDED.

3 DR. FISHER: SO MOVED.

4 DR. DULIEGE: I SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, FRED AND
6 ANNE-MARIE. THANK YOU. THE FLOOR IS OPEN TO
7 DISCUSSION ON THESE APPLICATIONS FROM BOARD MEMBERS.
8 ANNE-MARIE, YOU'RE THE FIRST.

9 DR. DULIEGE: THIS WAS FOLLOW-UP TO OUR
10 PREVIOUS DISCUSSION. EACH TIME MEMBERS OF
11 APPLICATIONS REPLIED, SUCH AS THE TWO WE JUST HEARD,
12 I REALLY WANT TO ADD MY PERSPECTIVE AS A BOARD
13 MEMBER BECAUSE I CAN SENSE THEIR DISAPPOINTMENT.
14 AND PARTICULARLY IN THIS CASE WHEN THEY HAVE DONE AN
15 EFFORT OVER THE YEARS AND THEY SEE THAT BECAUSE OF
16 LACK OF FUNDING, THIS EFFORT IS GOING TO BE EITHER
17 COMING TO A SLOWING DOWN, MAYBE AN END UNLESS THEY
18 FIND THEIR OWN SOURCE OF FUNDING. AND WE ALL KNOW
19 THESE DAYS IT'S PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT TO FIND YOUR
20 OWN SOURCE OF FUNDING EXCEPT FOR THE CIRM. BUT I
21 HOPE THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THAT IT'S REALLY A MATTER
22 OF HOW MUCH MONEY WE HAVE HERE. IN FACT, IT IS NOT
23 A REFLECTION OF THE QUALITY OF THE WORK DONE IN THE
24 PAST AND PROPOSED IN THE FUTURE.

25 WE ARE LOOKING VERY CAREFULLY OF HOW WE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SPEND CIRM MONEY. THAT'S OUR RESPONSIBILITY, TO
2 MAKE SURE THAT IT CAN LAST FOR THE DURATION WE HAVE,
3 AND WE HAVE TO MAKE SOME CHOICES HERE. THESE ARE
4 HARD CHOICES, NOT SO MUCH FOR US TO MAKE REALLY,
5 IMPORTANT FOR US TO MAKE, BUT THE MOST DIFFICULT IS
6 FOR YOU AS A CONSEQUENCE OF OUR CHOICES. SO I STAND
7 BY OUR CHOICES, BUT I WANT TO EXPRESS MY COMPASSION
8 IN SOME WAY FOR THE CHALLENGES THAT YOU WILL NOW
9 FACE. OVER.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU,
11 ANNE-MARIE. I'M GOING TO PROCEED WITH COMMENTS FROM
12 OTHER BOARD MEMBERS. FRED FISHER, YOU'RE NEXT.

13 DR. FISHER: I WANT TO TAKE EXCEPTION TO
14 WHAT ANNE-MARIE JUST SAID IN TERMS OF CHARACTERIZING
15 THE REJECTION OF THE PROPOSALS STRICTLY DUE TO
16 FUNDING, WHICH I THINK MIGHT HAVE BEEN PROPELLED BY
17 A COMMENT BY MARV SOUTHARD.

18 I WAS ON THOSE REVIEW COMMITTEES. AND THE
19 WORK OF THE SPECIALISTS ON THOSE COMMITTEES IS OF
20 THE HIGHEST STANDARD. AND THOSE PEOPLE FAILED THOSE
21 PROPOSALS NOT BECAUSE THERE WASN'T ENOUGH MONEY TO
22 FUND THEM, BUT BECAUSE THEY WENT FROM BEING FLAWED
23 TO BEING MORE FLAWED. SO IT WASN'T JUST A MATTER OF
24 FUNDING. IT WAS A CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL
25 AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE APPLICANTS DID NOT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ADDRESS THE COMMENTS THAT WERE PROVIDED FOLLOWING
2 THE FIRST ROUND OF EVALUATIONS.

3 SO AS SOMEONE WHO SITS ON MANY OF THESE
4 COMMITTEES, I JUST WANTED TO SHARE THE PERSPECTIVE
5 THAT MY EXPERIENCE OF THESE PROPOSALS, SPECIFICALLY
6 THE LAST TWO THAT ANNE-MARIE WAS COMMENTING ABOUT,
7 WAS NOT ABOUT THE LACK OF FUNDING. IT WAS ABOUT THE
8 LACK OF IMPROVEMENT AND, IN FACT, SOME BACKTRACKING
9 THAT RESULTED IN THE LOWER SCORE.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANKS, FRED.

11 I DON'T SEE ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBERS
12 RAISING THEIR HAND. WE'LL PROCEED TO COMMENTS FROM
13 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

14 MS. MANDAC: WE HAVE TWO HANDS RAISED.
15 WE'LL START WITH DR. WILLERT AND THEN DR. SNYDER.
16 DR. WILLERT, YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES.

17 DR. WILLERT: HELLO. DEAR MEMBERS OF THE
18 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE, MY NAME IS KARL
19 WILLERT. I'M A PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
20 CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO, AND I'M THE PI ON THE
21 INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT 6.2, 15416, UNFORTUNATELY
22 SCORED AS TIER II AND, HENCE, HAS NOT BEEN
23 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

24 WHILE THIS IS QUITE DISAPPOINTING TO US,
25 WE VERY MUCH RESPECT THE DECISION REACHED BY THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. HOWEVER, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE
2 ONE LAST REQUEST TO THIS BOARD REGARDING OUR
3 APPLICATION. ALTHOUGH THE PROPOSED SHARED RESOURCE
4 LAB WAS DEEMED NOT A SIGNIFICANT VALUE PROPOSITION,
5 THE PROPOSED STEM CELL TECHNIQUES COURSE WAS VIEWED
6 AS WELL DESIGNED, RECEIVING 10 OUT OF 11 POSITIVE
7 REVIEWS. I'M HERE TO REQUEST THAT THIS PORTION, THE
8 EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING COMPONENT OF OUR GRANT
9 APPLICATION, RECEIVE THE PROPOSED FUNDING OF 1.3
10 MILLION.

11 ASIDE FROM IT RECEIVING HIGHLY FAVORABLE
12 REVIEWS AND COMMENTS, I'D ALSO LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT
13 THAT THIS PROPOSED TECHNIQUES COURSE IS A JOINT
14 EFFORT WITH OUR NEIGHBOR, THE SANFORD BURNAM PREBYS
15 MEDICAL DISCOVERY INSTITUTE. MY COLLEAGUE,
16 PROFESSOR EVAN SNYDER, WHO IS AT THIS INSTITUTE, HAS
17 WORKED WITH US AT UCSD TO COORDINATE AND INTEGRATE
18 OUR RESPECTIVE TEACHING AND TRAINING RESOURCES AND
19 EXPERTISE AND OFFERED A COMPREHENSIVE AND UNIQUE
20 CURRICULUM THAT WILL BE BENEFIT RESEARCHERS IN SAN
21 DIEGO AND ACROSS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

22 IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT WITH THE CURRENTLY
23 AWARDED GRANTS, THERE'S NO SUCH COMPREHENSIVE
24 TECHNIQUES COURSE IN SAN DIEGO DESPITE ITS HIGH
25 DENSITY OF ACADEMIC INSTITUTES AND BIOTECH INDUSTRY

1 THAT WOULD STAND TO BENEFIT FROM THIS VALUABLE
2 RESOURCE. I, THEREFORE, RESPECTFULLY ASK YOU TO
3 CONSIDER AWARDING US THE FUNDING PROPOSED FOR THE
4 TECHNIQUES COURSE PORTION OF OUR GRANT. THANK YOU
5 VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND YOUR VALUABLE SERVICE TO
6 THE STEM CELL COMMUNITY.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU,
8 PROFESSOR.

9 MS. MANDAC: THANK YOU SO MUCH, DR.
10 WILLERT. DR. SNYDER.

11 DR. SNYDER: GREAT. THANK YOU. I ALSO
12 WOULD LIKE TO PLEASE SPEAK ON BEHALF OF THE UCSD'S
13 APPLICATION, BUT MAKE AN UNUSUAL AND SOMEWHAT
14 CREATIVE REQUEST OF THE ICOC TO PLEASE CONTEMPLATE.
15 AS KARL MENTIONED, WE ON THE MESA CONSOLIDATED A
16 VERY COMPREHENSIVE COURSE THAT INCLUDED BOTH BASIC
17 AND ADVANCED TECHNIQUES VIA HANDS-ON AND DIDACTIC
18 INSTRUCTION. AND IT'S PIVOTAL TO THE UCSD
19 APPLICATION. AS KARL MENTIONED, IT WAS RANKED TIER
20 I BY 10 OF 11 REVIEWERS, CALLED THE STRENGTH OF THE
21 PROPOSAL AND SAID TO MERIT FUNDING.

22 IT WAS PRAISED FOR ITS THREE COMPONENTS.
23 A TWO-WEEK, THREE-TIMES-A-YEAR BOOT CAMP LIKE BASIC
24 COURSE LED BY JEAN LORING AND SUZANNE PETERS, WHO
25 ACTUALLY PUBLISHED THE LAB MANUAL FROM WHICH THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SYLLABUS WAS OBTAINED AND ALSO HAVE TAUGHT MANY OF
2 THESE COURSES. A TEN-WEEK LECTURE COURSE WHICH PUTS
3 ALL OF THE TECHNIQUES IN BROAD PERSPECTIVE. AND
4 THEN SMALL MINI COURSES FOR SOPHISTICATED, DEEP DIVE
5 WHICH WAS ALSO TERMED TO BE QUITE UNIQUE.

6 THERE WAS ALSO A MAJOR EMPHASIS ON
7 CLINICAL CORRELATION AND INDIVIDUALIZED CURRICULUM.
8 BUT I THINK THE MOST APPEALING AND UNIQUE PART OF
9 THIS THAT I'M HOPING THAT THE ICOC WILL PAY
10 ATTENTION TO IS THAT WE CONFIGURED THE BUDGET AND
11 THE TUITION TO BE ABLE TO GIVE AT LEAST FIVE TRAVEL
12 AND TUITION AWARDS EVERY YEAR, EVEN MORE IF REVENUE
13 EXCEEDED COSTS, TO UNDERSERVED AND UNDERRESEORCED
14 COMMUNITIES. WE DOCUMENTED IT IN OUR DEI STATEMENT
15 HOW WE WOULD REACH OUT TO THESE COMMUNITIES. CIRM
16 TRAINEES WOULD OBVIOUSLY GET TUITION-FREE TRAINING,
17 BUT THEN WOULD BECOME TEACHING ASSISTANTS AND
18 MENTORS, LEARNING TO MENTOR, GETTING A STIPEND. AND
19 REGIONAL COMMUNITY UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES HAVE
20 INDICATED IN THEIR LETTERS OF SUPPORT HOW THEY WOULD
21 SEND STUDENTS TO THIS COURSE TO BE ABLE TO GET
22 COLLEGE CREDIT FOR TASKS AND SKILLS THEY CANNOT
23 IMPART.

24 SUSTAINABILITY WAS NOT ONLY BY TUITION,
25 BUT BY CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP. THERE'S A STEM CELL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALUMNI GROUP. OUR GOAL IS TO GET THE NEXT
2 GENERATION INTO THE PIPELINE TO BE ABLE TO TAKE
3 ADVANTAGE OF CUTTING-EDGE TECHNIQUES. THERE IS NO
4 SUCH COURSE SOUTH OF L.A. TO MY KNOWLEDGE, CERTAINLY
5 NOT IN SAN DIEGO. AND I'M SIMPLY ASKING WHETHER THE
6 UNUSED PORTION OF THE ALLOCATED BUDGET, WHICH
7 EXACTLY MATCHES THE NEEDS OF THIS COURSE, COULD BE
8 CREATIVELY USED FOR THIS COURSE WHICH CAN SERVE THE
9 ENTIRE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN A WAY THAT IS NOT --

10 MS. MANDAC: THANK YOU SO MUCH, DR.
11 SNYDER. YOUR TIME IS UP. WE DO HAVE ONE MORE
12 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC THAT WANTS TO SPEAK. CATHERINE
13 LEIJA, YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES.

14 MS. LEIJA: DEAR CIRM MEMBERS OF THE
15 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE, THANK YOU FOR YOUR
16 VALUABLE TIME TODAY AND EFFORTS TOWARD ACCELERATING
17 STEM CELL RESEARCH IN CALIFORNIA. CONGRATULATIONS
18 TO THE SELECTED APPLICANTS, WISHING YOU ALL THE BEST
19 SUCCESS. IT IS AN HONOR TO BE CONSIDERED AMONG SUCH
20 NOVEL SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS. MY NAME IS CATHERINE
21 LEIJA FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO,
22 REPRESENTING DR. KARL WILLERT'S INFRASTRUCTURE 6.2
23 15416 APPLICATION.

24 I'M SPEAKING TO HUMBLY REQUEST THE
25 REMAINING 1.8 AVAILABLE BUDGET BE GRANTED TO OUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CORE FACILITY OPERATIONS AND TECHNIQUE COURSE
2 OFFERINGS, 1.5 MILLION TOWARD TECHNIQUE COURSE, 500
3 K TOWARDS OPERATIONS AND/OR EQUIPMENT. WE WILL
4 CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE ADDITIONAL 650 K FROM
5 INTERNAL SUPPORT WHICH INCLUDES THE 20-PERCENT
6 CO-FUNDING AND OPERATIONAL COSTS, TOTALING 2.45
7 MILLION IN FUNDS TOWARDS EDUCATION, OUTREACH, AND
8 RESEARCH OFFERINGS.

9 I WANT TO EXPRESS MY GRATITUDE TO THE
10 REVIEWER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS. WE APPRECIATE YOUR
11 POSITIVE WORDS ON THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND RESPECT
12 THE FEEDBACK. OUR GOAL IS TO IMPLEMENT THE STEM
13 CELL COURSE OFFERINGS AND PURCHASE THE MOST VALUABLE
14 PIECE OF EQUIPMENT THAT FOCUSES ON STEM CELL BIOLOGY
15 OVER TRADITIONAL CELL SORTERS. IF EQUIPMENT IS NOT
16 ACCEPTABLE, I KINDLY REQUEST FUNDS BE ALLOCATED
17 TOWARDS THE HEFTY SERVICE CONTRACTS WHICH ARE ON
18 AVERAGE 125,000 A YEAR.

19 WE CURRENTLY PARTICIPATE WITH SEVERAL
20 CIRM-FUNDED PROGRAMS SUCH AS CIRM BRIDGES, CIRM
21 EDUCATIONAL CORE TRAINING GRANTS, CIRM SPARK PROGRAM
22 TO NAME A FEW. THESE CHANNELS INCREASE THE PRESENCE
23 OF CIRM AT THE SANFORD CONSORTIUM FOR REGENERATIVE
24 MEDICINE. THE BUILDING HOUSES 35 PLUS LEADING
25 SCIENTIFIC FACULTY MEMBERS AND HUNDREDS OF PROJECT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SCIENTISTS, STUDENTS, POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS, VISITING
2 SCHOLARS, AND INTERNS SPECIALIZING IN INFINITE
3 DISCOVERY.

4 I HELP TO OVERSEE THE FINANCES AND
5 OPERATIONS OF THIS CORE AND TWO OTHERS IN OUR
6 BUILDING ALONG WITH DOZENS OF PROGRAMMATIC EVENTS
7 AND EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH. I SPEAK WITH CONFIDENCE
8 TO GAIN YOUR VOTE AND ASSURE EACH ONE OF YOU HERE
9 TODAY THAT WE ARE THE BEST ASSET TO INVEST IN. I
10 HOPE TO CONVINCE EACH OF YOU IN OUR COMPETENCE TO
11 PRODUCE NOVEL STEM CELL-BASED MODELING TECHNIQUES
12 AND SCIENTIFIC FINDINGS TOWARD LIFESAVING
13 REGENERATIVE MEDICINES AND THERAPIES THAT WILL
14 TRANSFORM THE RESEARCH WORLD.

15 WE ARE HAPPY TO RESUBMIT THE APPLICATION
16 WITH A REVISED BUDGET AND PROJECT PROPOSAL IF
17 APPLICABLE. HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS AND
18 MEETINGS TO DISCUSS THE ENDLESS OPPORTUNITIES OF
19 WORKING TOWARDS PROSPERITY. WITH THE GRACIOUS
20 INITIAL FUNDING FROM CIRM, THIS CORE AND THE
21 BUILDINGS BROUGHT TO LIFE, WE WISH TO MANIFEST THE
22 FUTURE OF CONTINUOUS GROWTH WITH OUR FUNDERS. YOUR
23 VALUABLE SUPPORT AND TIME ARE GREATLY APPRECIATED.
24 THANK YOU AND HAVE A WONDERFUL DAY.

25 MS. MANDAC: THAT IS IT FOR PUBLIC

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 COMMENT.

2 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. ANY FINAL
3 COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS? OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO
4 PROCEED TO A VOTE. ONCE AGAIN, THIS IS A VOTE TO
5 FUND THREE APPLICATIONS AND NOT TO FUND THREE. DO I
6 NEED TO STATE THE APPLICATION NUMBERS?

7 MR. TOCHER: NO. I THINK IT'S FINE TO
8 JUST SAY TO ACCEPT THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS
9 REGARDING FUNDING.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THAT'S IT.

11 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE. YOU'RE ON MUTE.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ANNE-MARIE, YOU'RE
13 MUTED. ANNE-MARIE, CAN YOU START AGAIN?

14 DR. DULIEGE: I'M IN A CAR IN ENGLAND AND
15 TRYING TO MANAGE ON MY CELL PHONE. IN REGARDS TO
16 THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE, I WOULD LIKE IF ANY OF
17 YOU, MARIA, VITO, OR J.T., COULD COMMENT ON HOW
18 REALISTIC, RELEVANT, AND ACCEPTABLE ARE THE
19 PROPOSALS THAT WERE JUST MADE BY THE PEOPLE WHO JUST
20 INTERVENED. THANK YOU.

21 MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE CANNOT
22 COMMENT BECAUSE SHE HAS A CONFLICT WITH REGARD TO AT
23 LEAST ONE APPLICATION IN THE BUNCH. I CAN JUST SAY,
24 IF I COULD LEAP TO THE HEAD OF THE LINE, ANNE-MARIE,
25 FROM A PROCESS STANDPOINT, OF COURSE, THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE IS TASKED WITH
2 FOLLOWING THE CONCEPT PLAN THAT WAS ADOPTED BY THE
3 BOARD AND THE TERMS THAT ARE ENDORSED BY THE BOARD
4 WHEN IT ADOPTS A CONCEPT PLAN THAT GENERATES THE
5 ENSUING RFA.

6 SO AT LEAST FOR OUR PURPOSES TODAY, IT'S
7 NOT FEASIBLE FOR THE COMMITTEE TO SORT OF RE-IMAGINE
8 HOW THE RFA MIGHT BE CHANGED TODAY. SO I JUST
9 WANTED FROM A PROCESS STANDPOINT TO MAKE THAT
10 COMMENT. I DON'T KNOW IF J.T. OR VITO OR OTHERS
11 HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: J.T., WOULD YOU LIKE
13 TO TAKE A STAB AT IT?

14 DR. THOMAS: YEAH. ANNE-MARIE, I
15 COMPLETELY AGREE WITH SCOTT. WE HAVE A VOTE HERE ON
16 THE ITEMS THAT ARE IN FRONT OF US AND ARE NOT
17 CAPABLE AT THIS TIME OF ADDRESSING THESE SUGGESTIONS
18 AS THEY ARE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF WHAT IS BEFORE US.

19 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I AGREE ALSO.
21 IRRESPECTIVE OF THE BUDGETARY CONSTRAINTS, THIS
22 MEETING TODAY IS NOT THE FORUM TO CONSIDER AN
23 AMENDMENT, NOT TO THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR, BUT TO
24 THE WHOLE UNDERLYING CONCEPT PLAN THAT WAS APPROVED
25 BY THE BOARD. BUT I'M SURE IT WILL BE A TOPIC OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ONGOING DISCUSSION.

2 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

3 APPRECIATE THE RESPONSE AND THE CLARIFICATION.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DRIVE ON THE RIGHT
5 SIDE OF THE ROAD.

6 DR. DULIEGE: YEAH, A CHALLENGE.

7 MR. TOCHER: ALL RIGHT. I'LL PROCEED WITH
8 THE ROLL CALL.

9 DAN BERNAL.

10 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

11 MR. TOCHER: AS A PROCESS POINT, LET ME
12 REMIND JUST MARIA BONNEVILLE AND MARK
13 FISCHER-COLBRIE THAT ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE WHEN YOU
14 INDICATE YOUR VOTE.

15 MARIA BONNEVILLE.

16 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
17 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

18 MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.

19 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.

20 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

21 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

22 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

23 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
24 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. FISHER: YES.
2 MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
3 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
4 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
5 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
6 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.
7 MR. LAJARA: YES.
8 MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
9 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
10 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
11 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
12 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
13 DR. PADILLA: YES.
14 MR. TOCHER: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
15 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
16 MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.
17 DR. XU: YES.
18 MR. TOCHER: THANKS VERY MUCH, MEMBERS.
19 THE MOTION CARRIES.
20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MOTION CARRIES.
21 THIS IS THE TIME IN THE MEETING FOR ANY
22 GENERALS COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ANYTHING WE'VE
23 DISCUSSED TODAY OR ON ANY ITEM THAT WAS NOT ON THE
24 AGENDA. NOT HEARING ANY, I'M GOING TO THANK ALL THE
25 BOARD MEMBERS WHEREVER YOU ARE FOR PARTICIPATING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TODAY. AND A SPECIAL THANKS TO HAYLEY AND GIL FOR
2 THEIR WONDERFUL PRESENTATIONS THAT HELPED US THROUGH
3 THIS. THANK YOU ALL. THE MEETING IS ADJOURNED.

4 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 10:12 A.M.)
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 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JULY 25, 2024, 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