

**California Institute for Regenerative Medicine  
Scientific and Medical Research Facilities Working Group Search  
Subcommittee**

**DRAFT Summary Minutes of Subcommittee Meeting**  
**May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2005**

**Roll Call**

<b>Michael Friedman (Chair)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Robert Klein</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Ted Love</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Claire Pomeroy</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Francisco Prieto</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>John Reed</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Gayle Wilson</b>	<b>Present</b>

The opening discussion of the meeting dealt with Phyllis Preciado's move to Oregon and her need to resign from the ICOC and from all 3 CIRM Working Groups. This means that the Facilities Working Group appointments to be considered on June 6, 2005 will lack one Patient Advocate member.

Question: Can we require the new Patient Advocate appointee to the ICOC to be on one or more Working Groups?

- Legal counsel advised that we cannot require new patient Advocate appointee to be on any Working Group.
- We will have to find another volunteer, either from among the other ICOC Patient Advocates or the new appointee who will take Dr. Preciado's place on the ICOC.

Question: Can the Facilities Working Group function without all advocate members appointed?

- Yes, the Working Group can function without full Working Group in place or present; need a quorum to conduct business, which would be 7 of the 11 total members.

**Dr. Friedman:** expressed his thanks to the Subcommittee and the interview teams for all the work put into this. We have an excellent slate of candidates.

**Discussion of the plan for presenting the slate to ICOC on 6/6:**

- We intend to give ICOC full opportunity to consider all candidates and will present written summaries and scoring.
- Candidates were scored using system this subcommittee developed.
- Full slate should go forward – they are all qualified candidates, some to serve on the Working Group or serve as Alternates, and the others valuable expertise the Working Group could use on an ad-hoc basis.
- 8 candidates have the highest scores; 3 are scored slightly lower because they may lack sufficient time, specific science facility expertise or the like – these are the suggested Ad-Hoc members.
- The 3 Ad hoc members should be retained as part of pool for future use in ad hoc roles for particular reviews when their expertise is required.
- The 3 individuals recommended for ad hoc status were:
  - Archibald
  - D’Elia
  - Shiff
- Being sensitive to public evaluation of candidates, comment from counsel?
  - Because these individuals are not employees or officers, the personnel part of meeting law doesn’t apply. Discussing publicly is appropriate.
- Suggestion: Subcommittee members are ready to talk about top candidate he or she interviewed-all the candidates were good. This process was carried out and it became clear which candidates were at the top.
- How to present information to full ICOC:
  - Put forth all 8 who got a score of 4 or more.
  - Rank top scores highest – some got a score of 4+.
  - Let ICOC make final decision – give them 8 options, with a strongly recommended top 4 for the Working Group.
  - 4 on Working Group, 4 Alternates, other 3 Ad Hocs.

**Agenda Item #4**

**Consideration of Real Estate Specialist members of the Scientific and Medical Research Facilities Working Group**

Each candidate was discussed by the Subcommittee, based on resumes and Information Forms and also the scores and detailed input of Subcommittee members who interviewed each candidate. Through this discussion, the Subcommittee arrived at decisions on which candidates were to be recommended as Working Group Members, which as Alternates and which as Ad-Hocs. Since all candidates were good, and had already been through a vetting process that disqualified anyone with conflicts of interest, all 11 candidates were selected for the final slate as either a Working Group Member, an Alternate or an Ad-Hoc contact.

- It was recognized that there is an advantage to geography balance and skill balance.

- All 11 will be presented to ICOC; top 4 as Working Group members.

**Candidate Rankings**

**Top 4:**

- Doms
- Hysen
- Kashian
- Lichtenger

**First Alternate:**

- Laff

**Alternates:**

- Frager
- Mock
- Spieker

**Ad-Hocs**

- Archibald
- D'Elia
- Shiff

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Don Reed: It's good to have people that really want to serve. It sounds like a few of your candidates are in that category, which is good.

**ACTION TAKEN: Motion for slate of 8 going forward. Gayle Wilson moved the Subcommittee put forth 8 people; Doms, Frager, Hysen & Kashian as Working Group Members; Laff as First Alternate; Lichtenger, Mock, & Spieker also as Alternates. Robert Klein seconded the motion. A roll call vote was conducted with the following results:**

<b>Michael Friedman (Chair)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Robert Klein</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Ted Love</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Claire Pomeroy</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Francisco Prieto</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Reed</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Gayle Wilson</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**ACTION TAKEN:** Bob Klein moved the Subcommittee put forth the remaining 3 candidates, Archibald, D'Elia and Shiff, as Ad-Hocs. Ted Love seconded this motion. A roll call vote was conducted with the following results:

Michael Friedman (Chair)	Yes
Robert Klein	Yes
Ted Love	Yes
Claire Pomeroy	Yes
Francisco Prieto	Yes
John Reed	Absent
Gayle Wilson	Yes

- Formal letter to be sent thanking candidates, for Bob Klein to sign. Emphasis on willingness to apply and be discussed publicly.
- Each candidate was excellent, but each brought varying skill sets and experiences.

### Agenda Item #3

#### Consideration of Disease Advocate Members of the Scientific and Medical Research Facilities Working Group

**ACTION TAKEN:** Ted Love moved the Subcommittee put forth to the ICOC for approval the slate of Patient Advocates who have volunteered to be on the Facilities Working Group. This motion was seconded by Gayle Wilson. A roll call vote was conducted with the following results:

Michael Friedman (Chair)	Yes
Robert Klein	Yes
Ted Love	Yes
Claire Pomeroy	Yes
Francisco Prieto	Yes
John Reed	Absent
Gayle Wilson	Yes

### Agenda Item # 5

#### Consideration of candidate(s) to serve as Chairperson and Possible Vice-Chairperson for the Scientific and Medical Research Facilities Working Group

- Chair for Initial term of one year and someone who has time.

**Action Taken:** Ted Love moved that Rusty Doms be contacted regarding serving as Chair of the Facilities Working Group, with the stipulation that if he says "yes", he

will be recommended to the ICOC as Chair. Bob Klein seconded this motion. A roll call vote was conducted with the following results:

Michael Friedman (Chair)	Yes
Robert Klein	Yes
Ted Love	Yes
Claire Pomeroy	Yes
Francisco Prieto	Yes
John Reed	Absent
Gayle Wilson	Yes

- Possible Vice Chair being a Patient Advocate
  - Sherry Lansing- Co-Chair for Standards Working Group.
  - Joan Samuelson- Vice-Chair for Grants Working Group.
  - Suggestion of David Serrano Sewell made and agreed upon.
  - Mr. Serrano Sewell is a good choice because of his legal skills.

**Action Taken:** Francisco Prieto moved that David Serrano Sewell be asked about serving as Vice Chair of the Facilities Working Group, with the stipulation that if he says "yes", he will be recommended to the ICOC as Vice-Chair. Gayle Wilson seconded this motion. A roll call vote was conducted with the following results:

Michael Friedman (Chair)	Yes
Robert Klein	Yes
Ted Love	Yes
Claire Pomeroy	Yes
Francisco Prieto	Yes
John Reed	Absent
Gayle Wilson	Yes

#### Agenda Item # 6

**Consideration of developing Case Study Models for facilities grants and process for reviewing facilities grant proposals.**

- Case Study Models Discussion
  - In order to begin to inventory the types of facilities required to conduct the different kinds of research and take advantage of unique opportunities, Letters of Intent should be requested from non-profit Institutions willing to participate in case studies exercise, including lab

reconstruction, new facility construction as part of Center of Excellence, core service facilities, etc.

- LOI's: 5 page written content with supporting materials as addenda.
- Bring case studies to July 12 meeting. This is not a guarantee or commitment for funding -- is to allow the scientific team to inventory ideas and help people develop case study models.
- Use of construction funds is highly sensitive. There is a cap as per Prop 71 of 10% grant \$/state funds going to facilities grants.
- There are important opportunities to supplement and magnify funds for facilities by- getting matching funds from philanthropists thus making sure we get best use of every tax \$/bond \$.
- Timing: construct the facilities needed around the state early in the cycle (10 years) and do it efficiently.
- While the strategic plan will be developed top down, we also want a bottom up approach for facilities grants - get information from institutions regarding what they are planning and what they need.
- There are many issues that should be dealt with before we award any facilities grants, beginning with a of list of questions that need to be discussed and answered before we commit funds we are committed to using funds in the best way possible. Those questions include:
  - What research will CIRM funded facilities be used for? HESCR only? Mouse stem cell research? Fetal stem cell research? Adult stem cell research?
  - Will these facilities conduct only SCR, or will other types of complimentary research be done there?
  - What is the long term commitment of each facility grant receiving institution to stem cell research? Once the grant period expires, will they use the facility for something else?
  - What sort of indirect costs will each grant receiving institution cover on its own? (Upkeep utilities, maintenance, etc.) Or will the CIRM partially fund this?
  - What will be the cultural values and priorities for these facilities?
    - a. Will there be an explicit commitment to share resources?
    - b. Will facilities be willing to serve more than one institution? How will this be managed?
    - c. As part of determining funding priorities - will past accomplishments be considered?
    - d. What will be the relationship between private industry and these facilities?
    - e. What opportunities will there be for foreign scientists to interact in these facilities?
- Need to get public comments on there and other important issues in formal way:
  - Currently there are public comments at meetings, and letters are submitted.
  - We suggest a web site process for this. Design a simple form to capture information.

- Pilot trial: Citizens to comment on Facilities issue.
- Entry portal only-data capture.
- Needs to be done in a way that doesn't overwhelm staff; should be forwarded by CIRM staff to Dr. Friedman and ICOC.

**ACTION ITEM:**

Staff to create letter welcoming case study models requesting information – these “Request for Ideas” (RFI), including:

- 5 pages max.
- One unique institutional based proposal per institution.
- This allows ICOC to begin to inventory the kinds of facilities that will be necessary to conduct the research.

*Initiative says there is preference for leverage- put this in letter requesting information. This is a preference - not limited to this.*

By the time we have an actual Facilities Grant RFP, we will have a better sense of options and challenges of each type of facility.

**QUESTIONS:**

- How will process go?
- What is the goal of idea letter?
- What do institutions get out of process?

This is not an institution total plan-that comes later. This RFI is a slice of their plan. Have to give people an idea of size of case studies, timing for review, etc.

No funds awarded even for case studies.

One idea per institution works vs. collaborative proposal.

Any institution may also submit an idea to, encourage collaborative interactions. Therefore, one unique idea per institution and one collaborative idea with other institutions can be considered.

Scale/Size: Need preliminary info to know what needs are; then in Case Study process Working Group can come to ICOC for direction when have info on scale.

With the \$300 million we award in facilities grants, we hope there will be additional philanthropic facility funds to augment this effort.

Strategic plan will provide some direction; strategic plan will get input from this process

Lots of institutions will have multi component idea such as:

- Wet Lab,
- Animal Facility
- GMP

This should not be comprehensive proposal. Agreed,

The document that is created from carrying out this RFI process will be helpful to everyone who ultimately gives proposals.

Need a rough budget because of the need to estimate the demand -- just conceptual estimates.

Put two or more components together if they are integral to each other- i.e mouse facility for wet lab.

Have to determine the interactions between Grants Working Group and Facilities Working Group. Patient Advocates overlap on Grants Working Group & Facilities

When do Scientists on Grants Working Group see Facilities Grant proposals?  
What will be the meeting process for Facilities Working Group? Also ready for motion we recommend to ICOC this pilot- letter Request for Ideas from non-profit Institutions: Unique Facilities, Shared Facilities.

Letters to be solicited, present case studies at July

**ACTION TAKEN: Motion made by Bob Klein to allow subcommittee to ask staff to send out letter requesting information - RFI. Ted Love seconded this motion. A roll call vote was conducted with the following results:**

<b>Michael Friedman (Chair)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Robert Klein</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Ted Love</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Claire Pomeroy</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Francisco Prieto</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Reed</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Gayle Wilson</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Discussion on Meeting Policy for Facilities Working Group:**

- Facilities Working Group Meetings
  - The intent is to be as open as much as possible- set policy this way, determine procedures and philosophic direction.
  - Closed for aspects of grant review and aspects of individual proposed review.
- Report to Board
  - Discussion of and decisions on



- Policy, standards, criteria for selection would be public-done in public meetings.
- Subcommittee will recommend meeting policy to ICOC and ICOC will decide on the final policy.
  
- Unique science review to be conducted like NIH
  - Get feedback from Science/Grant Working group to Facilities Working Group, then Facilities Working Group completes review based on facilities issues.
  
- Facilities Working Group discussions should be public except under following circumstances:
  - There are other donors for a project who wish to remain confidential/anonymous.
  - Financial issues of Institution must be kept confidential.
  - Active land negotiations.
  - Active construction contract negotiations.
  - Grant Working Group scientist members providing input on strength of faculty at an applicant institution, and their ability to execute the broad scope of the proposed research.
  
- Scientific evaluation would be kept confidential

**ACTION ITEM:** CIRM Staff and legal counsel to draft Facilities Working Group Meeting Policy for consideration by ICOC at July 12 meeting.