

# California Institute for Regenerative Medicine

## Summary Minutes of the Independent Citizens Oversight Committee (ICOC) to the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM)

Site Search Committee

Meeting on January 25, 2005, 11 a.m. – 1 p.m.

University of California, San Francisco

### Roll Call

|                   |         |
|-------------------|---------|
| John Reed         | Present |
| Richard Murphy    | Present |
| Claire Pomeroy    | Present |
| Michael Friedman  | Present |
| Sherry Lansing    | Present |
| Bob Klein (Chair) | Present |

### **Agenda Item #3. Consideration of the draft version of the Request for Proposal for a long-term facility for the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, with any amendments and edits as necessary.**

Bob Klein opened discussion by referring to the draft RFP proposed (made available to the public and published on the website) and calling upon the subcommittee to make any changes to criteria, as necessary.

### **Comments from the Sub Committee Members:**

- Clarifying question about item #6 on the RFP? Irrevocable and held open for 75 days? (Sherry Lansing)
  - *We want to give board maximum flexibility since they are simultaneously responsible for recruiting highly desirable candidates (Bob Klein)*
- This is not the temporary site? (Sherry Lansing)
  - *Correct, ICOC provided the Chair with ability to work on a temporary site (Bob Klein)*
- Can we get a site pro bono? (Sherry Lansing)
  - *Yes, every dollar we save on a site is a dollar we can put into research (Bob Klein)*
- Do you envision that external reviewers from out of state would be carrying out these reviews at this site? If so, do we need nearby lodging? (Michael Friedman)
  - *Excellent point. The Grant Review Working Group will be addressing this item but the point is highly relevant and consideration should be given if there are*

## *California Institute for Regenerative Medicine*

*lodging facilities that are made available at a reduced cost or at no cost as an accommodation to the activities of the Institute (Bob Klein)*

- Language of the RFP should be kept as simple and as broad as possible so that we have as much flexibility as possible in looking at sites (John Reed)
- Indicate that the committee will maintain discretion to weight criteria based upon overall balance and attributes of each proposal.
- We should expand the eligible sites to include the Central Valley (Phyllis Preciado)
- We should expand wording to say seeks office space close to a major center of biomedical research, period, and doesn't predetermine which area that would be in (Claire Pomeroy)
- Also a question about a need for background information which might be included in an RFP rather than going straight to the criteria i.e. what is ratio of office space to conference space? (Claire Pomeroy)
  - *Excellent point. We can ask the Department of General Services to get very specific technical advice of that kind. (Bob Klein)*
- Have we given any thought to having a main office and then a satellite office space that would be closer to another region's activities? (Richard Murphy)
  - *We can consider down the road; the intent is to at least get a primary site functional for staff as soon as possible. (Bob Klein)*
- We might want to consider moving the sites for peer review periodically, to engage people in different parts of the country (Richard Murphy)
  - *Excellent point. We need to take that to the Subcommittee working with Grants nominees, as well (Bob Klein)*

### **Comments from the Public:**

- Consideration should be given to secure internet facilities and hard-wired capability for conference rooms (Philip Posner)
- Clarification: RFP specifies five parking spaces per 1,000 square feet; we would like breakdown between spaces for permanent employs versus visitors.. (Jesse Blout)
  - *We'll need to take to the on-site technical advisors if that is adopted as part of this process (Bob Klein)*
- Suggestion for a cyberspace virtual CIRM campus (Marc Strassman)
- Suggestion for consideration of Sacramento area as long-term site location (Robert Burris)
- Suggestion that city of Sacramento, in partnership with local developer, is preparing a package offer for the ICOC (Tom Zeidner)
- Suggestion that the city of San Diego is preparing a comprehensive and competitive proposal (Andrea Moser)

### **Comments from the Sub Committee Members:**

- Ensuring that the geographic restrictions are lifted from the RFP (Sherry Lansing and Michael Friedman)
- Ensuring that technical specifications and requirements are submitted 3-4 days in advance of the 2/3 ICOC board meeting (Claire Pomeroy)
- John Reed made the point that none of these items are determinative individually (Bob Klein)

## *California Institute for Regenerative Medicine*

- We have two sets of items: required and those that represent a preference. We need to clarify (Ed Penhoet)
- Number 2 (compliance with ADA) is a real requirement but what about 15,000 feet? ADA compliance is a requirement, close to a major center of biomedical research, but I am not sure we can divide them so stringently (Phyllis Preciado)
- Should we make it desirable, not a requirement to have facilities be held open for 75 days? (Bob Klein)
  - Perhaps with the exception of number 2 (Compliance with ADA), these items would be weighted, and we're not saying that all of them have to be achieved, but these are recommended possibilities (Sherry Lansing)
- ADA as an example of legal requirements that are non-negotiable; I've asked General Counsel to research this and indicate if there are any other state law requirements that need to be adopted and amended into this as specific requirements. (Bob Klein)

Bob Klein then switched discussion to the technical timetable for the RFP process. He suggested that if the Sub-committee is able to meet the technical timetable for exhibits during the board discussion on 2/3/05, and the board approves the modified RFP on that date, that the finalized RFP should go out in the subsequent 1-2 business days. He then suggested that the deadline for proposals be two weeks thereafter.

### **Comments from the Sub Committee Members:**

- Worried that the time-frame is too aggressive (Phyllis Preciado)
- Supportive of the two-week turnaround time-frame (Claire Pomeroy)
- Would 30 days allow more time for the most attractive proposals to coalesce? (John Reed)
  - What about a compromise at three weeks? That would potentially allow us to convene this sub-committee before the next ICOC meeting (3/1/05) so that the ICOC could, potentially, take action (Bob Klein)

Bob Klein then turned to a summary of four basic points: 1) The CIRM staff will be working with the state office of facilities administration on technical support and other state experts in order to provide technical guidance on the facility under question with the goal of getting that to the members three to four days before the next board meeting, 2) we will state as an additional item on the criteria list various optimizing considerations such as lodging or conference without limiting that list, 3) we would provide a very clear statement that no one item would be determinative, that there are legal requirements which would be viewed as unconditional requirements of the RFP, 4) the intended timetable is to attempt to consider this at the February 3<sup>rd</sup> Board Meeting, within the following two days to put out the amended RFP, within 3 weeks, thereafter to schedule a publicly noticed meeting of this committee to consider the proposals. All proposals must be submitted in that time period and that recommendation from our committee would then go to the board, if timing permits, at the March 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting.

### **Comments from the Public:**

- Under the timetable, when would 75 days commence? (Joe Mockyer)
  - *The intent was 75 days from submission (Bob Klein)*
- When would the lease commence after the RFP is approved? (Joe Mockyer)

## *California Institute for Regenerative Medicine*

- *A statement will need to be made by the committee, but it is critical to get the staff into facilities as soon as possible, as in within the next 30-45 days (Bob Klein)*
- Will local government representatives have the opportunity to schedule a meeting before actually submitting the proposal? (Allison Riley)
  - *My reaction is that in order to accommodate local government, we can set up staff meetings to help them answer questions; but determinative information will be posted on the website (Bob Klein)*
- Would there be accommodation for a time frame for tenant improvements? (Jesse Blout)
  - *The committee should consider timing on an equal basis, so the owners would have to cite the timing specifications/needs upfront (Bob Klein)*
- Two-to-three weeks is adequate but moving as fast as you are is inadvisable. The site search committee should sit down and determine the needs of the staff beforehand, and these should be weighted before proposals come in. I'd also like to see a specific provision in the RFP allowing a cyber city, cyber space alternative (Marc Strassman)
- It would be good if you had DGS involved in these discussions (David Holtzman)
  - *My experience with cities is that they generally work in good faith with institutions trying to locate in their jurisdictions. But, in any case, we have significant real estate experience available to us, and we will make staff available for consultations. (Bob Klein)*
- Clarification on time frame: if the RFP goes out on 2/7, with three weeks to respond, that takes us to 2/28, which is a day before the next ICOC meeting? What is your intent with the 3/1 meeting—to have the packets available to the ICOC? (Jane Signaigo-Cox)
  - *That calculation is correct, but we would need to see the quantity and quality of proposals.—we would definitely need more than one day to review proposals. (Bob Klein)*
  - *What if we amend the timetable to 17 days? (Phyllis Preciado)*

### **Comments from the Sub Committee Members:**

- We can put all of the pertinent required information in our first paragraph of the RFP (Sherry Lansing)
- If I understand correctly, the final decision could be made on or before 3/1, but what about allowing time for site visitations? (Richard Murphy)
  - *A very good point which should likely be added to the process and considered on 2/28—and a reason to ask the board to approve the process and approve the criteria that have been used, but to delegate the final decision to the committee. We could create 2-member teams to visit the sites, with staff, and as soon as we know how many sites there are, we can make the decision on what timeframe is necessary to accomplish these visits. (Bob Klein)*
- Two pieces of background information would be very helpful: 1) background assumptions, 2) for the 3/1 meetings, a matrix which lists all the quantifiable characteristics—major and minor—and how responsive the proposals are. (Richard Murphy)
  - *Agreed. (Bob Klein)*

## California Institute for Regenerative Medicine

- We should also provide the public with some sort of visual of what it is we are considering (Phyllis Preciado).
- To clarify: deadline for RFP's is 2/24, this committee would reconvene on 2/28 to move forward, before our 3/1 ICOC meeting? (Claire Pomeroy)
  - *Yes, although the process is open to change, subject to the number and scale of proposals. That will dictate the process ultimately (Bob Klein)*
- The Board may wish to make the final recommendation on proposals given the importance of this, and I think seeking the board's advice on 3/1 is the right thing to do. (Richard Murphy)
  - The goal is to come to a final vote at the 4/7 board meeting (Bob Klein)

### **Comments from the Public:**

- How much will this campus cost? What range are you thinking of? (unidentified speaker)
  - *The range encompasses the potential for no rent, which, we have heard, is very real—to \$2.00/square foot (Bob Klein)*
- Two weeks seems like plenty of time to give for institutions interested, and we are putting too much pressure on the board (Don Reed)
- Will there be opportunities to present proposals? (Jesse Blout)
- I support the need for a matrix, that the ICOC make the final decision, and that a cyber alternative is allowed (Marc Strassman)
  - *We will address the cyber alternative in a separate motion, if desired by the Site Search sub-committee (Bob Klein)*
- Do we know we are meeting all of the legal requirements for RFP's? (David Holtzman)
  - *Our counsel is standing by, and is paying great attention to the legal requirements (Bob Klein)*

**Motion to consider the timeframe amended to deadline for the RFP of 2/24/05, meeting of the Site Search subcommittee 2/28/05 to consider recommendation for the balance of the process as well as a matrix of assumptions—with a goal of a final vote by the board on 4/7, passes by unanimous vote by all present.**

Bob Klein then asked if any board members wished to address the suggestion from the public on a cyber site, and none wished to do so.

### ***Agenda Item #4. Adjournment***

#### **Action Items**

- Staff to prepare background information on technical needs
- Prepare matrix of quantifiable criteria—required and preferred—for Search Sub-committee meeting
- finalize and send out CIRM site RFP week of 2/7
- Notice and prepare agenda for Site Search Sub-committee meeting for 2/28