#### BEFORE THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT

#### **REGULAR MEETING**

LOCATION: ZOOM

SEPTEMBER 23, 2021 DATE:

9 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2021-19

INDEX	
ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
ACTION ITEMS	
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT: CIRM SCHOLAR RESEARCH TRAINING AWARDS EDUC 4.	5
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1,2 OR 3).	21
CLOSED SESSION	NONE
5. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANGINFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARD DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELAPPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDAND 4 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30 (B) AND (C)).	CIAL CH OR ATING TO A ITEMS 3
DISCUSSION ITEMS	

NONE

36

2

6. PUBLIC COMMENT.

7. ADJOURNMENT.

1	SEPTEMBER 23, 2021; 9 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ALL SET. GOOD
4	MORNING, EVERYBODY. WELCOME TO THE SEPTEMBER 2021
5	REGULAR MEETING OF THE ICOC AND APPLICATION REVIEW
6	SUBCOMMITTEE. MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
8	MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
10	YSABEL DURON.
11	MS. DURON: HERE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
13	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
15	DR. FISHER: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
17	DR. FLOWERS: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
19	DAVID HIGGINS.
20	DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
22	MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
24	MR. LAJARA: HERE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. WE HAD
	3

ī	DETH G. DIGHN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	DAVE. WE'LL COME BACK TO HIM. CHRISTINE
2	MIASKOWSKI.
3	DR. MIASKOWSKI: PRESENT.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
5	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
7	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
9	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
11	MR. ROWLETT: PRESENT.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
15	MR. TORRES: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
17	DR. WATSON: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. WE HAVE A
19	QUORUM.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
21	BEFORE WE GET TO THE ACTION ITEMS, AL,
22	STEVE, OR GIL, DO YOU WANT TO MAKE ANY PRELIMINARY
23	COMMENTS?
24	MR. JUELSGAARD: IT WOULD BE CONSIDERED
25	GLOATING, SO NO.
	4

MR. ROWLETT: I AGREE WITH MY COLLEAGUE,
MR. JUELSGAARD.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. GIL, ANY
COMMENTS?
DR. SAMBRANO: NO COMMENTS FROM ME. THANK
YOU THOUGH.
MR. TORRES: THE ONLY COMMENT I HAVE IS IN
TODAY'S CHRONICLE, THEY HAD A WONDERFUL STORY ON TWO
YOUNG WINEMAKERS WHO ARE PICKING GRAPES FROM OLD
ITALIAN VINEYARDS OUTSIDE THE DODGER STADIUM.
MS. DURON: IS THAT USING STEM CELLS?
DR. MARTIN: YES, HAS TO BE.
MS. DURON: AND THE COMMENT IS ACCEPTED.
IT'S NOT OUT OF BOUNDS.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. NOW THAT WE'VE
GOT THAT OUT OF THE WAY THANK YOU, ART MOVE ON
TO THE ACTION ITEMS. FIRST ONE IS CONSIDERATION OF
APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO PROGRAM
ANNOUNCEMENT FOR THE CIRM SCHOLAR RESEARCH TRAINING
AWARDS, THE SO-CALLED EDUCATION 4 AWARDS. WE'LL
FIRST HAVE A PRESENTATION FROM GIL.
DR. SAMBRANO: GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. I
JUST NEED TO SHARE MY SCREEN. IT'S NOT DOING IT.
GIVE ME A SECOND.
MS. BONNEVILLE: GIL, DO YOU WANT US TO
5

1	GET THE ONE THAT'S POSTED ON THE WEBSITE UP AND
2	RUNNING?
3	DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH, MAYBE. I DON'T KNOW
4	WHY THIS COMPUTER IS NOT DOING IT.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: DOUG, CAN YOU GRAB THAT.
6	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU SO MUCH, DOUG.
7	CAN YOU GO ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE.
8	SO THESE ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE
9	GRANTS WORKING GROUP AS IT PERTAINS TO THE RESEARCH
10	TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE CIRM RESEARCH SCHOLARS. SO
11	THIS SLIDE, JUST TO REMIND EVERYBODY, THAT WE
12	CONTINUE TO FUND OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS ALL OF OUR
13	PILLARS FROM DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, CLINICAL, AND
14	INFRASTRUCTURE, AND IN THIS CASE EDUCATION.
15	ON THE NEXT SLIDE IS A REMINDER OF THE
16	DIFFERENT TYPES OF PROGRAMS THAT WE SUPPORT UNDER
17	THE EDUCATION PILLAR. SO WE SUPPORT EVERYTHING FROM
18	HIGH SCHOOL THROUGH CLINICAL FELLOWS. RECENTLY WE
19	HAD THE BRIDGES PROGRAM THAT GOT RELAUNCHED, AND
20	WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF LAUNCHING THOSE NEW AWARDS.
21	THERE WERE 15 FOR THE BRIDGES PROGRAM THAT WERE
22	RELAUNCHED. WE HAVE APPLICATIONS IN FOR THE SPARK
23	HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM. AND, OF COURSE, THIS PROGRAM
24	THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT TODAY IS THE
25	RESEARCH TRAINING THAT COVERS PREDOCTORAL,

1	POSTDOCTORAL, AND CLINICAL FELLOW AWARDS.
2	FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, WE'VE
3	SUPPORTED THESE TYPES OF PROGRAMS IN THE PAST FROM
4	2006 THROUGH 2016 IN PARTICULAR FOR THE RESEARCH
5	TRAINING AWARDS. THE OBJECTIVE WAS TO CREATE A
6	DIVERSE CADRE OF SCIENTISTS WITH KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
7	IN STEM CELL RESEARCH THAT WE TERM CIRM SCHOLARS
8	AGAIN TARGETING PH.D. STUDENTS, POST-DOCS, AND
9	M.D'S.
10	SO EACH INSTITUTION UNDER THIS OLD PROGRAM
11	OFFERED A SINGLE, INTEGRATED PROGRAM OF TRAINING
12	THAT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEVELS THAT
13	THEY OFFERED AT THEIR OWN INSTITUTION. SO IF, FOR
14	EXAMPLE, THEY HAD A GRADUATE PROGRAM, THEY COULD
15	THEN OFFER TO TRAIN PH.D. STUDENTS; OR IF THEY HAD A
16	MEDICAL SCHOOL OR A CLINICAL PROGRAM, THEY COULD
17	OFFER TO TRAIN CLINICAL M.D.'S. AND SO THOSE WERE
18	OFFERED UP UNTIL 2016. I THINK THE LAST ONE CLOSED
19	IN 2017. WE DIDN'T RENEW THE PROGRAM AT THAT POINT,
20	I THINK, IN TERMS OF ASSESSING PRIORITIES OF CIRM AT
21	THE TIME WITH THE TAIL END OF PROP 71 FUNDS. WE
22	DETERMINED THAT WE WOULD NOT ISSUE ANOTHER CYCLE OF
23	THOSE. BUT NOW THAT WE ARE RELAUNCHING PROGRAMS, WE
24	DECIDED TO GO FORWARD WITH A NEW PROGRAM. SO THE
25	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

1	THIS IS STILL HISTORICAL INFORMATION.
2	THIS IS JUST TO SHOW A GENERAL MAP OF THE
3	DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAMS THAT WE HAD IN THE PAST
4	WHICH COVERED FROM NORTH TO SOUTH CALIFORNIA. NEXT
5	SLIDE PLEASE.
6	THAT PROGRAM TRAINED ABOUT 940 SCHOLARS
7	AND HAD MOSTLY POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS, BUT A HIGH
8	REPRESENTATION OF PH.D. STUDENTS AND M.D.'S AS WELL.
9	THE RESEARCH THAT WAS CONDUCTED BY THESE TRAINEES
10	DURING THE COURSE OF THEIR TENURE, USUALLY ABOUT TWO
11	TO THREE YEARS, WAS OVER A THOUSAND PUBLICATIONS
12	THAT CITED SPECIFICALLY SUPPORT FROM THE TRAINING
13	GRANT PROGRAM. AND WE DID A SURVEY IN 2013. OUT OF
14	430 OR SO, WE LEARNED THAT 56 PERCENT OF THE
15	TRAINEES AT THE TIME, ONCE THEY FINISHED, CONTINUED
16	ON TO FURTHER TRAINING, WHICH MAKES SENSE FOR MANY
17	OF THEM, PARTICULARLY THE PREDOC STUDENTS. 14
18	PERCENT ADVANCED TO ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACULTY
19	POSITIONS, 10.5 ADVANCED TO AN INDUSTRY POSITION,
20	AND 12 ADVANCED TO SOME OTHER TYPE OF POSITION SUCH
21	AS TEACHING OR MEDICAL PRACTICE. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
22	SO FOR THE 2021 CIRM SCHOLARS TRAINING
23	PROGRAM, WE OPENED THIS UP TO CALIFORNIA
24	UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES AND NONPROFIT ACADEMIC
25	RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS AS WE DID BEFORE. THE BOARD

1	APPROVED UP TO 100 MILLION TO SUPPORT UP TO 20
2	AWARDS. EACH AWARD PROVIDES UP TO FIVE MILLION FOR
3	UP TO FIVE YEARS FOR THE PROGRAM. AND THIS SUPPORT
4	CAN BE FOR ANY COMBINATION OF PREDOC, POSTDOC, OR
5	CLINICAL TRAINEES AS IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE
6	INSTITUTION.
7	SO NOW INTO THE WAY THE GRANTS WORKING
8	GROUP SCORED THESE AND ASSESSED THESE. THE SCORING
9	SYSTEM THAT WAS USED FOR THIS WAS ON A SCALE OF $1\  ext{TO}$
10	100 WITH 85 TO 100 BEING A RECOMMENDATION TO FUND.
11	ANYTHING BELOW THAT IS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.
12	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
13	THE REVIEW CRITERIA THAT WERE USED ARE THE
14	FOLLOWING: DOES THE PROPOSED PROGRAM HOLD THE
15	NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT,
16	MEANING WHAT VALUE IT PROVIDES OVERALL AND WHAT
17	IMPACT IT WILL HAVE ON THE TRAINEES? SECONDLY, IS
18	THE TRAINING PROGRAM WELL PLANNED AND DESIGNED? IS
19	IT PRACTICAL AND ACHIEVABLE? AND FINALLY, DO THEY
20	HAVE A TRACK RECORD AND OUTCOMES FROM A PRIOR
21	TRAINING PROGRAM, WHETHER CIRM OR OTHERWISE, THAT
22	DEMONSTRATES SUCCESS? NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
23	SO THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE GWG
24	RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THIS PROGRAM. WE HAD 18
25	APPLICATIONS THAT WERE SUBMITTED. THERE WERE 18

THAT WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING FOR A TOTAL
APPLICANT REQUEST OF ABOUT 86 OR JUST OVER 86
MILLION. AND SINCE WE HAVE A HUNDRED MILLION
AVAILABLE, WE ARE CERTAINLY WITHIN THE BUDGET TO
FUND ALL OF THE ONES THAT ARE RECOMMENDED. THE CIRM
TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND ALL 18 PROJECTS THAT
HAVE A SCORE OF 85 OR GREATER.
SO THAT IS THE SLIDE PRESENTATION. AND IF
YOU COULD PUT UP THE EXCEL SHEET, IF YOU HAVE IT,
THAT SHOWS THE LISTING OF THE PROGRAMS.
THANK YOU. SO AS YOU CAN SEE, ALL OF THE
PROGRAMS WERE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING AND SCORED
BETWEEN 85 AND UP TO 98 IN TERMS OF THE RANGE OF
SCORES. SO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT'S IT FOR ME FOR NOW.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
GIL. DO WE HAVE A MOTION WE'RE GOING TO VOTE EN
MASSE HERE MOTION TO APPROVE THE 18 RECOMMENDED
PROGRAMS FOR FUNDING?
DR. MARTIN: I SO MOVE.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE. IS
THERE A SECOND?
MR. ROWLETT: I SECOND.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL.
QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
MS. DURON: YES, MR. CHAIR. THIS IS
10

1	YSABEL.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HELLO, YSABEL.
3	MS. DURON: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY.
4	COUPLE OF QUESTIONS HERE, ALTHOUGH I DID SEE SOME
5	COMMENTS OR REMARKS LATER ON VIS-A-VIS A FEW OF THE
6	PROGRAMS. WHAT I'D LIKE TO SEE US ADD, GIL, EVEN ON
7	CRITERIA NO. 5, IS TRACKING OF DEI ALONG THESE
8	PROGRAMS SO THAT WE ARE ASKING THEM TO GIVE US DATA
9	SO THAT WE CAN KNOW THAT, IN FACT, THEY'RE GROWING
10	WITHIN THE COMPLEMENT OF DOCS AND POSTDOCS, ET
11	CETERA, ET CETERA, OR WHATEVER STAGE OF EDUCATION
12	THEY'RE AT, THAT THEY'RE ACTUALLY INCREASING THE
13	NUMBERS OF REPRESENTATIVES AND STUDENTS FROM
14	COMMUNITIES OF COLOR WHERE THEY'RE UNDERREPRESENTED,
15	PARTICULARLY AT THE PH.D. LEVEL. AND SO THAT WE CAN
16	BEGIN TO ADDRESS HOW ARE WE GOING TO GROW THE
17	ABILITY FOR THESE YOUNG KIDS WHO NOT ONLY COME INTO
18	THESE TRAINING PROGRAMS, BUT SUCCEED IN THESE
19	TRAINING PROGRAMS.
20	I'M NOT IN MY MIND GETTING ENOUGH
21	FEEDBACK, AND I KNOW THAT GIL ADDRESSED IT AT ONE
22	POINT. I WANT TO SEE WHAT PERCENTAGE OF DIVERSITY
23	IS REPRESENTED IN EACH OF THESE PROGRAMS AND HOW
24	THEY'RE SHOWING PROGRESSION OVER TIME THAT THEY ARE
25	DELIBERATELY AND INTENTIONALLY TAKING STEPS TO

1	IMPROVE THEIR RECRUITMENT AND SUPPORTING SUCCESS OF
2	THESE STUDENTS AS THEY GO THROUGH THESE PROGRAMS,
3	PROCESSES, PROJECTS. SO WE'RE GOING TO GET
4	REPRESENTATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE WITH SOME
5	EQUALITY OVER TIME. THIS IS BASICALLY A
6	MINORITY/MAJORITY STATE. AND WE NEED TO MAKE SURE
7	THAT THESE STUDENTS ARE HERE, REPRESENTED, LEARNING,
8	AND ABLE TO MOVE THE STATE FORWARD IN STEM CELL AND
9	ALL OTHER RESEARCH.
LO	SO I THINK WE NEED SOME MORE CLARITY,
L1	MAYBE MORE DEFINITIVE ON A CRITERIA AS I'M VIEWING
L2	THIS. AND I DON'T KNOW IF NOW IS THE TIME TO
L3	ACTUALLY BRING IT UP, BUT I JUST FELT THAT I NEEDED
L4	TO SAY THAT.
L5	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
L6	QUESTION, AND IT'S AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT THAT WE DID
L7	INCORPORATE FOR THIS PARTICULAR CYCLE BECAUSE THESE
L8	ARE THINGS THAT WE WANTED TO ENSURE. ALTHOUGH IN
L9	THE PAST WE HAVE TRACKED THE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND
20	GENDER DIVERSITY OF TRAINEES, EACH TRAINEE THAT'S
21	APPOINTED, WE HAVE AN APPOINTMENT FORM FOR THEM SO
22	THAT WE CAN TRACK A LOT OF THIS INFORMATION. BUT WE
23	MADE IT A POINT, AND IT WAS PART OF WHAT WAS
24	ASSESSED BY THE GWG, WAS NOT ONLY THEIR TRACK
25	RECORD, BUT THEIR PLANS FOR HOW THEY WILL DIVERSIFY

1	THE COHORT OF STUDENTS THAT COME IN AND HOW THEY
2	WILL TRACK. AND SO YOU MAY SEE IN SOME OF THE
3	SUMMARIES SOME OF THE CRITIQUES FROM REVIEWERS
4	RELATED TO HOW GOOD THEIR PLAN IS OR IN SOME CASES
5	THAT IT NEEDS WORK. SO IT IS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT
6	THAT WE'VE INCORPORATED.
7	ONE OF THE OTHER THINGS THAT WE WANT TO DO
8	IS ALSO, AND THIS WAS RECOMMENDED BY THE GWG, TO
9	FIND A WAY TO ESTABLISH BEST PRACTICES AMONG THE
10	PROGRAMS SO THERE IS THE BENEFIT OF HAVING ALL OF
11	THESE PROGRAMS WHERE THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS CAN LEARN
12	FROM ONE ANOTHER AND SHARE BEST PRACTICE
13	INFORMATION. I THINK A LOT OF THAT MAY COME FROM
14	HAVING JOINT MEETINGS WITH THEM AS WELL AS JUST OUR
15	ONGOING MONITORING OF THESE PROGRAMS.
16	SO IT'S A GREAT QUESTION AND SOMETHING
17	THAT WE ARE THINKING ABOUT CERTAINLY AS WE MOVE
18	FORWARD WITH THESE PROGRAMS.
19	MS. DURON: FOLLOW-UP, MR. CHAIR?
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY.
21	MS. DURON: WHAT I THINK I'D REALLY LOVE
22	TO SEE, GIL, THOUGH, IS I'D LIKE TO SEE IT ON PAPER
23	AND A REPORT SO I CAN STOP GUESSING ABOUT HOW WELL
24	THEY'RE DOING AND ALSO ALLOW THE PUBLIC AT SOME
25	POINT IN TIME TO HAVE ACCESS TO SEE HOW WELL WE ARE

1	DOING IN MAKING SURE THAT THERE IS, IN FACT, A
2	DIVERSITY REPRESENTED FOR THE STUDENTS AND THE
3	ACCESS TO BE ABLE TO TRAIN IN THESE KINDS OF
4	PROGRAMS. SOMEONE DOESN'T WANT ME TO TALK.
5	THE OTHER THING I WANTED TO SEE, BECAUSE I
6	SAW THE GEOGRAPHIC MAP OF WHICH INSTITUTIONS ARE
7	ENGAGED AND IT'S VERY COASTAL, WHAT ARE WE DOING TO
8	BRING IN CENTRAL VALLEY AND OTHER COLLEGES AND/OR
9	UNIVERSITIES THERE WHERE THERE'S A LOT OF
10	UNDERREPRESENTATION, I THINK, IN OUR FUNDING AND OUR
11	RESEARCH AS WELL AS OUR STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES TO GET
12	ENGAGED. EVEN IF WE HAVE INSTITUTIONS IN TERMS OF
13	BEST PRACTICES, TALK ABOUT BIG BROTHER KINDS OF
14	PROGRAMS WHERE THEY WILL REACH OUT TO AN INSTITUTION
15	THAT IS NOT REPRESENTED AND SEE IF THEY CAN'T BRING
16	SOME OF THEIR STUDENTS TO CO-PARTNER IN THE PROGRAM
17	OR OTHER ACADEMICS TO CO-PARTNER WITH THEM IN A
18	RESEARCH PROJECT.
19	I JUST WORRY THAT WE ARE LOSING, IN FACT,
20	SOME OF THAT DIVERSITY BY NOT BRINGING IN SOME OF
21	THESE INSTITUTIONS, THE STATE COLLEGES AND THE
22	MIDDLE-OF-THE-VALLEY INSTITUTIONS. I DON'T KNOW IF
23	ANYBODY ELSE, MAYBE ADRIANA PADILLA MIGHT HAVE SOME
24	IDEAS ABOUT THAT AS WELL. I'M JUST CONCERNED.
25	DR. PADILLA: YSABEL, I TOTALLY AGREE. I
	1.4

1	THINK IT'S BEEN A CHALLENGE TO BRING IN FOLKS FROM
2	INSTITUTIONS FROM THE VALLEY. AND I'M NOT SURE IF
3	THEY'RE JUST NOT GETTING THE INFORMATION, IF THEY'RE
4	JUST NOT BEING ENCOURAGED. I LIKE YOUR IDEA OF THE
5	BIG BROTHER PHILOSOPHY, HAVING INSTITUTIONS FROM BIG
6	CITIES WHERE USUALLY THE MEDICAL SCHOOLS ARE LOCATED
7	REACH OUT TO INLAND EMPIRE, CENTRAL VALLEY, NORTH
8	FRONTIER AREAS FOR THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES OR THE
9	STATE INSTITUTIONS TO GET INVOLVED.
10	I DON'T KNOW WHAT ELSE TO DO EXCEPT FOR
11	REALLY DO MORE REACH-OUT, MORE INFORMATION, MORE BIG
12	BROTHER TYPE OF ACTIVITIES.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL, FOR
14	THAT SUGGESTION. THANK YOU, ADRIANA, FOR YOUR
15	COMMENTS. I THINK THAT IS A VERY GOOD IDEA. THIS
16	IS AN OUTSTANDING PROGRAM. WE'VE SEEN FROM GIL'S
17	STATS FROM THE EARLIER ITERATION THE TREMENDOUS
18	VALUE THIS ADDS TO OUR CONTINUUM OF EDUCATION
19	PROGRAMS. SO THE MORE WE CAN DO TO ENCOURAGE
20	REPRESENTATION THROUGHOUT THE STATE CLEARLY THE
21	BETTER. SO THANK YOU, YSABEL, FOR RAISING THAT
22	POINT.
23	OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS
24	OF THE BOARD?
25	DR. FISHER: SORT OF ALONG THE LINES OF

1	THE ISSUE THAT YSABEL IS RAISING, I'M WONDERING, AND
2	MAYBE THIS IS FOR ANOTHER TIME, HOW DO INSTITUTIONS
3	THAT PROVIDE TRAINING LEARN OF THIS OPPORTUNITY? IT
4	SEEMS LIKE THAT WOULD BE PART OF THE KIND OF
5	OUTREACH NECESSARY TO DIVERSIFY THE CADRE OF
6	STUDENTS BEING ENGAGED, BUT IT STARTS WITH THE
7	INSTITUTION KNOWING ABOUT THE FUNDING AND GOING
8	THROUGH THE PROCESS. I'M UNFAMILIAR WITH WHAT CIRM
9	DOES TO MARKET THESE OPPORTUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE
LO	STATE TO VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS, BOTH CLINICAL AND
L1	RESEARCH ORIENTED.
L2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
L3	ANSWER THAT PLEASE?
L4	DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. SO WE ISSUE A
L5	SOLICITATION FOR THESE. WHERE WE CAN, WE CERTAINLY
L6	DO SORT OF A WE HAVE A LISTSERV AND DO A BULK
L7	EMAIL OUT TO DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS TO MAKE THEM
L8	AWARE OF THESE OPPORTUNITIES. I THINK ALSO WITHIN
L9	EACH PROGRAM, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE ENCOURAGE
20	AND WILL CONTINUE TO DO SO AS WE MONITOR THEM IS TO
21	PARTNER WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS THROUGHOUT
22	CALIFORNIA IN TERMS OF DIVERSIFYING THEIR COHORT OF
23	STUDENTS AND TO DO OUTREACH THEMSELVES IN RECRUITING
24	PRE-DOCS, POST-DOCS, AND MEDICAL FELLOWS.
24 25	PRE-DOCS, POST-DOCS, AND MEDICAL FELLOWS.  SO I THINK IT'S BOTH BEFORE THEY APPLY AND

1	BECOMING AWARE OF THIS; BUT ALSO, EVEN ONCE WE FUND
2	EACH OF THESE PROGRAMS, THERE ARE WAYS IN WHICH WE
3	CAN SUPPORT THEM AND ENCOURAGE THEM TO DO MORE
4	OUTREACH THAT MAY ALLOW A GREATER DIVERSIFICATION OF
5	THEIR STUDENT POPULATIONS.
6	DR. FISHER: MY QUESTION WAS MORE HOW DO
7	THE, FOR THE LACK OF A BETTER TERM, PI'S ON THESE
8	REQUESTS KNOW THAT SUCH A FUNDING OPPORTUNITY IS
9	AVAILABLE?
10	DR. SAMBRANO: RIGHT. SO WHAT WE DO IS WE
11	DO EMAIL BLASTS OUT TO DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS TO LET
12	THEM KNOW. SO A LOT OF IT IS REALLY REACHING OUT TO
13	PEOPLE THAT WE KNOW, BUT I THINK THERE MAY BE BETTER
14	WAYS OF DOING IT THAT WE ARE HAPPY TO CONSIDER IN
15	TERMS OF HOW TO IMPROVE THE OUTREACH TO OTHER
16	INSTITUTIONS THAT MAYBE AREN'T GETTING THE WORD.
17	DR. FISHER: SO IF WE HAVE SOMEONE WHO IS
18	INTERESTED, IS IT REASONABLE FOR US TO REFER THEM TO
19	YOU TO ADD THEIR NAME ONTO THE LIST?
20	DR. SAMBRANO: OH, ABSOLUTELY, YES.
21	DR. FISHER: OKAY. THANKS.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR
23	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
24	MR. TORRES: ONE OTHER WAY TO REACH OUT IS
25	THROUGH THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE FOR THE COMMUNITY

1	COLLEGES AND THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE FOR THE STATE
2	UNIVERSITY SYSTEM. THEIR PR PEOPLE MIGHT BE OF
3	HELP. AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER YOUR SHOP IS DOING
4	THAT OR NOT, GIL. YOU MAY BE. SO JUST A
5	SUGGESTION.
6	DR. MARTIN: I'M ECHOING. I'M TRYING NOT
7	TO SORRY.
8	DR. FISHER: YOU MIGHT BE STILL ON YOUR
9	PHONE AND YOUR COMPUTER AT THE SAME TIME.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: TURN THE PHONE OFF,
11	DAVE. THAT SHOULD HELP.
12	DR. MARTIN: LET'S TRY IT AGAIN. MY PHONE
13	IS OFF.
14	AT THE PLANNING SESSION WEEK BEFORE LAST
15	WE HAD ON THE NEURO DATA INTENSITY AND AI, ET
16	CETERA, THERE WAS A QUESTION ASKED THAT I THOUGHT
17	WAS REALLY PERTINENT, AND I DON'T RECALL WHO ASKED
18	IT. WOULD THIS PROGRAM THAT WE WERE CONSIDERING
19	PROVIDE A LEGACY FOR CIRM? AND THERE WAS QUITE A
20	BIT OF DISCUSSION AROUND THAT. AND I TRIED TO MAKE
21	THE COMMENT ON THAT, AND I WAS HAVING PROBLEMS EVEN
22	BEING HEARD EVEN WITH AN ECHO.
23	AND I THINK MY COMMENT WAS THAT I BELIEVE
24	THAT, AND THIS IS A GOOD POINT, THIS SPREADSHEET,
25	THAT THE BIGGEST LEGACY FOR CIRM IS GOING TO BE ITS

1	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS BECAUSE THOSE ARE GOING TO
2	PERSIST FAR LONGER THAN THE MORE SENIOR TRAINED
3	PEOPLE IN INSTITUTIONS AND PROFESSORS, ET CETERA.
4	THIS TRAINING PROGRAM, AND THIS IS ONE OF THE MOST,
5	I GUESS, PROLIFIC ONE AND WELL FUNDED ONE, IS REALLY
6	IMPORTANT TO CIRM. GIL'S DATA SHOWS HOW IMPORTANT
7	IT IS JUST IN TERMS OF NUMBERS.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AGREED. THANK YOU,
9	DAVE. THANK YOU, ART, FOR THAT SUGGESTION. THAT
10	WAS AN EXCELLENT SUGGESTION.
11	OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
12	OF THE BOARD? ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
13	PUBLIC? MARIA, DO WE SEE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE DO NOT.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WILL YOU PLEASE
16	THEN CALL THE ROLL.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
18	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: AS A REMINDER, IF YOU
20	HAVE A CONFLICT, PLEASE RESPOND YES OR NO EXCEPT FOR
21	THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT. ANNE-MARIE
22	DULIEGE. YSABEL DURON.
23	MS. DURON: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
25	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
2	DR. FISHER: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
4	DR. FLOWERS: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
7	DAVID HIGGINS.
8	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
10	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
12	MR. LAJARA: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. CHRISTINE
14	MIASKOWSKI.
15	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE
16	WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
18	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
20	DR. PADILLA: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
22	MR. PANETTA: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
24	MR. ROWLETT: AYE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
	20

	·
1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
3	MR. TORRES: AYE, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
4	WHICH I AM CONFLICTED.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
6	DR. WATSON: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
7	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
9	CARRIES.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO
11	ACTION ITEM NO. 2, NO. 4 ON THE AGENDA,
12	CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE
13	TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS, PROGRAM
14	ANNOUNCEMENT CLINS 1, 2, AND 3. PRESENTATION FROM
15	GIL.
16	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU. DOUG, COULD YOU
17	PUT UP THE SLIDES FOR THE CLINICAL PROGRAM. THANK
18	YOU.
19	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THESE ARE THE
20	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ON THE
21	LATEST CYCLE OF OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM. JUST A
22	REMINDER OVERALL OF THE PROGRAM. THE CLINICAL STAGE
23	OPPORTUNITY IS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS THAT ARE LATE
24	STAGE PRECLINICAL THAT ARE DOING IND-ENABLING WORK.
25	THAT'S THE CLIN1. THERE'S ALSO THE OPPORTUNITY TO
	21
	/ 1

1	SUPPORT THE COMPLETION OF A CLINICAL TRIAL ITSELF.
2	THAT'S THE CLIN2 PROGRAM. AND THEN SUPPLEMENTAL
3	FUNDS FOR ACCELERATING ACTIVITIES, THAT'S THE CLIN 3
4	PROGRAM.
5	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO THIS IS A VIEW OF
6	OUR BUDGET THAT WAS ALLOCATED, AND IT IS ALLOCATED
7	ON AN ANNUAL BASIS BY THE BOARD FOR THE CLINICAL
8	PROGRAM. THERE WAS 162 MILLION THAT WAS DEDICATED
9	TO SUPPORT CLINICAL PROGRAMS. THE AMOUNT THAT'S
10	REQUESTED FOR THE ONE APPLICATION THAT'S BEING
11	CONSIDERED TODAY IS ABOUT 12 MILLION. WE HAVE 31
12	MILLION IN APPROVED AWARDS FROM THE LAST CYCLE THAT
13	INCLUDED, I THINK IT WAS, THREE APPLICATIONS. AND
14	WE HAVE ABOUT 119 REMAINING ASSUMING THAT TODAY'S
15	APPLICATION IS APPROVED.
16	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO THE REVIEW CRITERIA
17	THAT ARE UTILIZED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO
18	ASSESS CLINICAL PROGRAMS ARE THESE FIVE BASIC
19	QUESTIONS. DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY
20	SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT, MEANING WHAT
21	IS ITS VALUE AND IS THIS WORTH IT? DOES IT HAVE A
22	SOUND RATIONALE? IS IT WELL PLANNED AND DESIGNED?
23	IS IT FEASIBLE, INCLUDING DO THEY HAVE ALL THE
24	AVAILABLE RESOURCES AND APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUALS
25	INCLUDED ON THEIR TEAM? AND THEN, FINALLY, DOES THE
	22

1	PROJECT ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF UNDERSERVED
2	COMMUNITIES? NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
3	THE SCORING SYSTEM FOR CLINICAL
4	APPLICATIONS USES A SYSTEM OF 1, 2 OR 3. SOMETHING
5	WITH A SCORE OF 1 MEANING IT HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT.
6	SO A SCORE OF 1 MEANS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS
7	FUNDING. A SCORE OF 2 MEANS THAT IT NEEDS
8	IMPROVEMENT, AND TYPICALLY THOSE APPLICATIONS GO
9	BACK TO THE APPLICANT FOR REVISION AND GETS A
10	REVISIT BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AT THE NEXT
11	AVAILABLE CYCLE. OR A SCORE OF 3 IN WHICH IT IS
12	SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED AND DOESN'T WARRANT FUNDING AT
13	THIS TIME. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
14	SO ELEMENTS IN THE CIRM APPLICATION,
15	THERE'S A COUPLE OF THEM THAT I JUST WANT TO MENTION
16	THAT ARE RELATED TO DIVERSITY IN GENERAL. ONE IS
17	ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
18	THAT'S AN ELEMENT THAT HAS BEEN INCORPORATED INTO
19	OUR APPLICATIONS AND INTO THE REVIEW PROCESS NOW FOR
20	WELL OVER A YEAR. SO THIS SECTION DESCRIBES THE
21	APPLICANT'S PLAN FOR OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT OF A
22	DIVERSE PATIENT COHORT THAT ACCOUNTS FOR RACIAL,
23	ETHNIC, AND GENDER DIVERSITY. AND THE SECTION IS
24	EVALUATED AS PART OF THE OVERALL PROJECT, AND IT'S
2 -	
25	INCORPORATED INTO THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT SCORE. SO

1	THE SCORE YOU SEE OF $1$ , $2$ OR $3$ HAS INCORPORATED THE
2	ELEMENTS OF ENROLLMENT AND OUTREACH PLAN AND SO ON
3	BY THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF THE GWG.
4	IN ADDITION, WE ALSO HAVE A DIVERSITY,
5	EQUITY, AND INCLUSION SECTION WHICH DESCRIBES HOW
6	THE APPLICANT TEAM INCORPORATES DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES
7	AND EXPERIENCES TO IMPROVE THE PROJECT THROUGH THE
8	COMPOSITION OF THE TEAM ITSELF, THROUGH THEIR
9	TRAINING, AND ANY OTHER APPROACHES THAT THEY MAY
10	HAVE TO INCLUDE AND SHOW A COMMITMENT TO DEI. AND
11	THIS SECTION IS EVALUATED AND SCORED BY THE PATIENT
12	ADVOCATE AND/OR NURSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND SHOWN
13	IN THE DEI SCORE WHICH RANGES FROM ZERO TO TEN WITH
14	TEN BEING THE BEST POSSIBLE SCORE FOR DEI. NEXT
15	SLIDE PLEASE.
16	SO THIS IS THE SPECIFIC APPLICATION THAT'S
17	UNDER CONSIDERATION. IT IS CLIN2-12563. AND THIS
18	IS A T-CELL IMMUNOTHERAPY FOR PATIENTS WITH
19	HEMATOLOGIC MALIGNANCIES. SO THE THERAPY ITSELF IS
20	A CELL THERAPY PRODUCT. IT'S ALLOGENEIC T-CELLS
21	THAT ARE ENRICHED FOR REGULATORY T-CELLS THAT ARE
22	INFUSED FOLLOWING HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL
23	TRANSPLANT.
24	THE INDICATION IS FOR ANY HEMATOLOGIC
25	MALIGNANCY THAT REQUIRES HSCT TRANSPLANT IN ORDER TO

1	FOLLOW UP.
2	THE GOAL OF THIS CLINICAL TRIAL IS TO
3	COMPLETE A PHASE 1/1B TRIAL AND SELECT A PHASE 2
4	DOSE TO ASSESS SAFETY AND INITIAL EFFICACY. THE
5	FUNDS REQUESTED FOR THIS TRIAL ARE JUST UNDER 12
6	MILLION. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
7	A LITTLE BACKGROUND ON THE INDICATION. SO
8	HEMATOLOGIC MALIGNANCIES ARE THINGS SUCH AS ACUTE
9	LEUKEMIAS, LYMPHOMAS THAT ARE MOST COMMON IN
10	CHILDREN AND YOUNG ADULTS. THE CURRENT STANDARD OF
11	CARE, PARTICULARLY FOR THE HIGH RISK OR REFRACTORY
12	CANCERS OF THIS TYPE, IS CHEMOTHERAPY AND MAYBE
13	FOLLOWED BY ALLOGENEIC HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL
14	TRANSPLANT THAT COULD OFFER A CURE. HOWEVER, THERE
15	IS OFTEN A LACK OF MATCHED DONORS AS WELL AS A HIGH
16	RISK OF REJECTION OR GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE WHERE
17	THE GRAFT OR THE TRANSPLANT, BECAUSE IT HAS IMMUNE
18	CELLS, CAN ACTUALLY ATTACK THE PATIENT ITSELF.
19	THE PROPOSED THERAPY OFFERS THE
20	OPPORTUNITY FOR GREATLY IMPROVING OUTCOMES FOR
21	PATIENTS THAT ARE UNDERGOING HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL
22	TRANSPLANT BY REDUCING THE INCIDENCE OF THE GRAFT
23	VERSUS HOST DISEASE AND PROVIDING AN OPPORTUNITY FOR
24	RECONSTITUTION OF THE IMMUNE SYSTEM TO HELP PREVENT
25	INFECTION AND MAYBE EVEN HAVE ANTITUMOR EFFECTS.

1	WHY IS THIS A STEM CELL PROJECT? THIS
2	IS THE THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE IS MANUFACTURED IN
3	CD4 POSITIVE T-CELL PROGENITOR CELLS, AND IT IS ALSO
4	COMBINED WITH A HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL TRANSPLANT
5	AS A COMBINATION PRODUCT. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
6	IN TERMS OF SIMILAR PROJECTS IN OUR
7	PORTFOLIO, THIS IS A PRETTY UNIQUE PROJECT, ALTHOUGH
8	WE HAVE OTHER PROPOSED CELL THERAPIES FOR CANCERS,
9	WE DON'T HAVE AN ACCOMPANYING IMMUNOTHERAPY THAT'S
10	AIMED AT REDUCING GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE
11	SPECIFICALLY. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
12	AND THIS APPLICANT DOES NOT HAVE PREVIOUS
13	CIRM FUNDING. NEXT SLIDE.
14	AND SO THE SUMMARY OF THE REVIEW IS AS
15	FOLLOWS. THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE GWG IS TO
16	FUND. IT RECEIVED A SCORE OF 1 WITH UNANIMOUS VOTE
17	FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS. THE DEI
18	SCORE HAD A MEDIAN SCORE OF 9 FROM THE PATIENT
19	ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS. THE CIRM TEAM
20	RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS APPLICATION FOR A
21	TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT OF UNDER 12 MILLION. MR.
22	CHAIRMAN.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO
24	APPROVE?
25	MS. DURON: SO MOVED.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A SECOND?
2	MR. ROWLETT: SECOND.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL AND
4	AL. ARE THERE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
5	THE BOARD?
6	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIR, MAY I HAVE A
7	MOMENT?
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
9	MS. DURON: FIRST OF ALL, GIL, I DID NOTE
10	ON THIS THAT YOU ADDED IN THE DEI COMMENTS OR SCORE
11	FROM THE PATIENT ADVOCATES. AND I ALWAYS LIKE TO
12	HEAR WHAT THOSE ARE IN THIS SORT OF THING. I
13	APPRECIATED THE NOTES AND WHY THEY FELT THIS WAS A
14	STRONG APPLICATION.
15	SECOND OF ALL, I JUST READ AN ARTICLE FROM
16	LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY LOOKING AT ALL IN LATINO KIDS.
17	APPARENTLY THEY HAVE A MUCH HIGHER INCIDENCE AND
18	MORTALITY RATE OF ALL THAN THEY OTHER GROUP. AND
19	I'VE NOTED AND OVER THE YEARS HAVE SEEN AN
20	INCREASING AMOUNT OF PEDIATRIC CANCER IN THE LATINO
21	POPULATION. AND BECAUSE WE ARE ALSO A MUCH YOUNGER
22	POPULATION THAN NON-HISPANIC WHITE, THIS REALLY
23	BECOMES IMPORTANT TO START TO INTERVENE AS WE CAN IN
24	THE YOUNGER POPULATION.
25	AND I APPRECIATED THIS PARTICULAR GRANT

1	FOR THAT REASON AND WITH THAT KNOWLEDGE. BUT I
2	THINK IT'S ALSO CRUCIAL TO NOTE THAT THIS IS THE
3	EXACT REASON WHY WE NEED TO BE VERY COGNIZANT OF
4	IMPACTS OF THESE DIFFERENT CANCERS ON COMMUNITIES OF
5	COLOR BECAUSE I DARE TO SAY THAT IF YOU GO INTO SOME
6	LOW-INCOME LATINO POPULATIONS WHERE THEY'RE SPANISH
7	SPEAKING AND YOU START TALKING ABOUT CAR-T CELLS AND
8	PLEASE JOIN IN OUR STUDY, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO
9	UNDERSTAND A THING YOU SAY. AND, THEREFORE, I THINK
10	IT'S VERY NECESSARY TO MAKE SURE THAT, ALONG WITH
11	DOING THIS WONDERFUL RESEARCH, THAT THE EDUCATIONAL
12	MATERIALS IN ENGLISH AND SPANISH AND OTHER LANGUAGES
13	AS NECESSARY ARE MADE AVAILABLE SO THAT THE PATIENTS
14	AND THE PATIENT FAMILIES CAN PERFECTLY UNDERSTAND
15	WHAT'S GOING ON, WHY THIS IS HAPPENING, HOW IT CAN
16	IMPACT THEIR CHILD. OTHERWISE I DON'T THINK THAT
17	WE, AS CIRM, ARE DOING AS GOOD A JOB AS WE CAN TO
18	INFORM BOTH THE PUBLIC AND THE PATIENTS THAT WE ARE
19	TRYING TO SERVE HERE.
20	SO I REALLY APPRECIATE THIS PARTICULAR
21	GRANT. SO I'M ALL FOR IT. BUT I'D LIKE SOME OF
22	THAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE SURE TO GO BACK TO
23	THIS PARTICULAR RESEARCHER TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY'RE
24	DOING ALL THEY CAN TO INFORM THE PUBLIC AND THE
25	PATIENTS AND THE FAMILIES THEY'RE WORKING WITH ON

1	THIS IN A MANNER IN WHICH THEY WILL UNDERSTAND WHY
2	AND WHAT.
3	DR. MARTIN: I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.
4	CAN YOU HEAR ME AT THIS POINT?
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
6	DR. MARTIN: MY FIRST QUESTION IS JUST A
7	CLARIFICATION. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THIS IS NOT A
8	CAR-T. THIS IS NOT AN ENGINEERED CELL. IT'S A CELL
9	THAT IS DIFFERENTIATED FROM CD4 PRECURSOR CELLS; IS
10	THAT CORRECT, GIL?
11	DR. SAMBRANO: YES, THAT'S CORRECT. SO
12	IT'S NOT IN ANY WAY GENETICALLY MANIPULATED.
13	DR. MARTIN: MY SECOND QUESTION IS WHETHER
14	THE DONOR FOR THE STEM CELL TRANSPLANT IS THE SAME
15	DONOR FOR THIS ENRICHED POPULATION OF T-REGS.
16	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION. I
17	WAS LOOKING FOR THAT MYSELF, AND I'M NOT SURE
18	WHETHER THAT'S THE CASE OR NOT. I DON'T KNOW IF
19	ABLA CREASEY OR ONE OF THE OTHER FOLKS AT CIRM KNOWS
20	THE ANSWER TO THAT, WHETHER THE POPULATION IS FROM
21	THE SAME DONOR FOR THE HSCT'S.
22	DR. MARTIN: I THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT
23	BECAUSE YOU CAN REDUCE THE PROBABILITY OF REJECTION
24	OF ONE COMPONENT AND NOT THE OTHER.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE HAVE THE PRINCIPAL

1	INVESTIGATOR ON THE LINE. SO, J.T., IF YOU WOULD
2	LIKE THEM TO ANSWER, THAT'S AN OPTION RIGHT NOW.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
4	DR. GRAZIA: THANK YOU FOR GIVING ME THE
5	OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER. SO THE CELLS ARE FROM THE
6	DONOR OF THE STEM CELL TRANSPLANT. THEY ARE
7	DIFFERENTIATED IN VITRO, AND THEY CONTAIN THE
8	REGULATORY TYPE 1 CELLS FROM THE SAME DONOR.
9	DR. MARTIN: VERY GOOD. I FEEL BETTER
10	ABOUT THAT, AND I SUSPECT THE PATIENT WILL AS WELL.
11	MS. DURON: AND I SAY, MR. CHAIR, THANK
12	YOU TO DAVID FOR CORRECTING ME ON MY SLIGHT OR LESS
13	THAN HIGH KNOWLEDGE ABOUT STEM CELLS. SO THANK YOU
14	FOR THE CORRECTION, DAVE.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS TO BOTH OF YOU.
16	MARIA, I SAW THERE WAS ANOTHER HAND UP PRESUMABLY ON
17	THAT QUESTION, ALTHOUGH I DON'T SEE IT ANYMORE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK THE QUESTION WAS
19	ANSWERED.
20	DR. BERTAINA: YEAH. I JUST WOULD LIKE TO
21	ADD SINCE IT WAS A VERY YOU RAISED THE POINT
22	ABOUT THE COMMUNICATION IN THE RIGHT LANGUAGE, THAT
23	ALL OUR INFORMED CONSENTS ARE FULLY TRANSLATED IN
24	SPANISH FOR SURE BECAUSE THE LATINO POPULATION IS
25	OUR MAIN POPULATION. AND AN IN-PERSON INTERPRETER
	30
	JU

1	IS ALWAYS PRESENT WHEN WE DISCUSS THIS WITH THE
2	FAMILY. SO YOU CAN BE SURE THAT THE UNDERSTANDING
3	IS VERY CLEAR.
4	MR. TORRES: AND, OF COURSE, YOU PROVIDE
5	THE ITALIAN TRANSLATION, RIGHT?
6	DR. BERTAINA: YES.
7	MS. DURON: MAY I SAY SOMETIMES
8	TRANSLATION ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH. THERE ARE CULTURAL
9	NUANCES THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED EVEN IN CONSENTING
10	IN. SO I'M SURE THAT YOU'RE DOING THAT, AND PERHAPS
11	YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT YOU CAN SHARE
12	OVER TIME FOR OTHER RESEARCHERS WHO NEED TO KNOW
13	THAT A TRANSLATION IN AND OF ITSELF DOESN'T ALWAYS
14	GET THE JOB DONE FOR UNDERSTANDING.
15	DR. BERTAINA: SURE.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR
17	COMMENTS. OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS
18	OF THE BOARD?
19	MR. TORRES: I THINK THAT WAS AN IMPORTANT
20	ISSUE THAT YSABEL JUST CITED. IF YOU COULD JUST
21	EXPLAIN A LITTLE BIT MORE SO THE REST OF THE
22	PARTICIPANTS UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN BY CULTURAL
23	NUANCES BECAUSE IT IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE.
24	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIR, SHALL I?
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE.
	21

1	MS. DURON: OKAY. THANK YOU. WELL, ART,
2	THANKS FOR PUTTING ME ON THE SPOT HERE. BUT THIS IS
3	AN ISSUE THAT WE HAVE BEEN TRYING TO RAISE FOR QUITE
4	A FEW YEARS NOW ABOUT SIMPLE TRANSLATIONS FOR OTHER
5	COMMUNITIES, EVEN FROM ENGLISH TO ENGLISH, IS REALLY
6	IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THE COMMUNITY AND HOW IT
7	UNDERSTANDS THINGS, THE LANGUAGE IT USES, AND HOW IT
8	INTERPRETS THE MEANINGS OF WORDS AND PHRASES. SO
9	SOME THINGS TO ONE SET OF PEOPLE MAY MEAN SOMETHING
LO	ELSE, OR IT OPENS UP A WHOLE NEW SET OF QUESTIONS
L1	THAT NEED TO BE ANSWERED BEFORE THAT PERSON FEELS
L2	THAT THEY TRULY UNDERSTAND WHAT IS BEING DISCUSSED.
L3	AND SO I KNOW OVER TIME, WHEN WE WORKED
L4	VERY SPECIFICALLY IN EDUCATION WITH LATINO, SPANISH
L5	SPEAKING POPULATIONS, AND THOSE PERHAPS HAVE EVEN A
L6	LOWER LITERACY AND/OR LOW EDUCATION, THAT WE NEED TO
L7	BE VERY CLEAR AND VERY SPECIFIC THAT THEY UNDERSTAND
L8	WHAT WE ARE SAYING, NOT THAT WE BECAUSE WE DID IT
L9	IN SPANISH AND WE GAVE THEM A DOCUMENT IN SPANISH,
20	THAT EVERYTHING IS FINE. IT IS REALLY CRITICAL.
21	AND SOME WORK I'VE DONE EVEN WITH MEDIA AND
22	COMMUNICATION TRYING TO GET MORE VACCINE UPTAKE IN
23	SPANISH-SPEAKING COMMUNITIES, THAT THERE ARE
24	MULTIPLE CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION THAT BOMBARD AND
25	CAUSE A SOMEWHAT CHAOTIC RESPONSE IN TERMS OF

1	UNDERSTANDING WHICH IS RIGHT, WHICH IS REAL, WHICH
2	DO I UNDERSTAND, AND HOW DO I UNDERSTAND IT.
3	AND SO COMMUNICATION IN AND OF ITSELF
4	BECOMES A REALLY IMPORTANT SKILL SET THAT I THINK
5	RESEARCHERS NEED TO UNDERSTAND AND DEVELOP IN
6	SPEAKING TO DIVERSE COMMUNITIES TO MAKE SURE NOT
7	THAT YOU THINK THEY KNOW WHAT THEY SAY, BUT THEY
8	TELL YOU THEY UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN. A VERY
9	CRITICAL DIFFERENCE. THANK YOU, ART.
10	MR. TORRES: THANK YOU.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL.
12	OTHER QUESTIONS BY THE WAY, THAT'S WHY YOU'RE
13	CHAIR OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE. ANY OTHER
14	COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
15	ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL
16	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
18	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
20	MS. DURON: AYE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
22	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
24	DR. FISHER: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
	33

	2211 (121411), (11 (21 (11 (11 (11 (11 (11 (11 (11 (11
1	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
3	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
5	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
7	MR. LAJARA: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
9	DR. MARTIN: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
11	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
13	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
15	DR. PADILLA: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
17	MR. PANETTA: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
19	MR. ROWLETT: AYE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
23	MR. TORRES: AYE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
25	DR. WATSON: YES.
	24
	34

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
2	CARRIES.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
4	THAT CONCLUDES THE ACTION ITEMS ON TODAY'S AGENDA.
5	WE ARE NOW INTO PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY AND ALL
6	TOPICS. DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
9	HAVING HEARD AT THE OUTSET OF THIS MEETING FROM
10	STEVE, AL, AND GIL, I WOULD BE REMISS IF I DIDN'T
11	GIVE THE LAST WORD TO JOE PANETTA AND HIS THOUGHTS
12	ON THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS TEAM THIS SEASON.
13	MR. PANETTA: THANK YOU SO MUCH, MR.
14	CHAIRMAN. I WAS AFRAID YOU MIGHT DO THAT. ALL THAT
15	I CAN SAY ABOUT THE PERFORMANCE OF THIS TEAM THIS
16	SEASON IS THAT EVERYONE HERE IN SAN DIEGO EXPECTED
17	THAT THIS WAS THE YEAR AS WE DO EACH YEAR. AND EACH
18	YEAR DOWN HERE IN SAN DIEGO, WE JUST DON'T SEEM TO
19	GET THERE. SO I'M JUST GOING TO TELL YOU WE'LL BE
20	BACK NEXT YEAR.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
22	HOPEFULLY YOU WILL AVOID SINKING BELOW THE 500 MARK
23	WHICH YOU'RE FLIRTING WITH AT THE MOMENT.
24	MR. PANETTA: YEP, GOSH.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THAT CONCLUDES
	25

1	TODAY'S MEETING. MARIA, PLEASE, WHAT IS THE DATE
2	FOR THE OCTOBER MEETING, WHICH WILL BE A FULL
3	QUARTERLY MEETING OF THE BOARD?
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: OCTOBER 19TH.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WELL, THANK YOU,
6	EVERYBODY. LOTS OF GREAT COMMENTS TODAY. THANK
7	YOU, GIL AND TEAM, AS ALWAYS. THANK YOU, MARIA,
8	DOUG, AND TRICIA FOR FACILITATING. AND WE WILL SEE
9	EVERYBODY IN OCTOBER AS WELL AS SOME OF YOU PRIOR TO
10	THAT ON THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE WHICH IS COMING
11	UP SHORTLY. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH AND WE WILL CALL
12	THIS MEETING ADJOURNED.
13	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 9:52
14	A.M.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	36

#### REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2021, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152 133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO (208) 290-3543