BEFORE 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

VIA ZOOM LOCATION:

JANUARY 28, 2021 9 A.M. DATE:

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2020-01

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE	NO.
OPEN SESSION		
1. CALL TO ORDER.		3
2. ROLL CALL.		3
3. SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE ICOC.		6
ACTION ITEMS		
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.		8
5. CONSIDERATIONS OF ADOPTION OF INTERIM CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY FOR ADVISORY TASK FORCES.	1	3
DISCUSSION ITEMS		
6. DISCUSSION OF NEW ELEMENTS OF PROPOSITION 14. JAMES HARRISON MARIA MILLAN GEOFF LOMAX KELLY SHEPARD GIL SAMBRANO KENT FITZGERALD	2 8 9 10 14, 14	3 2 0 8
7. PUBLIC COMMENT.	16	9
8. ADJOURNMENT.	17	7

3

1	THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 2021
2	9 A.M.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU, MARIA.
5	A BELATED HAPPY NEW YEAR TO EVERYBODY. I WANTED TO
6	MENTION OFF THE TOP, AS THE WORLD CONTINUES TO
7	STRUGGLE WITH OUR COVID CRISIS, I WANTED TO COMMEND
8	TO YOU IN THE STRONGEST TERMS THE OUTSTANDING
9	INTERVIEW THAT DR. MILLAN CONDUCTED YESTERDAY WITH
10	DR. DERRICK ROSSI, WHO IS A 2006 CIRM SCHOLAR AND
11	ALSO THE CO-FOUNDER OF MODERNA. THE INTERVIEW WAS
12	JUST EXCELLENT, CHOCK FULL OF ALL SORTS OF GREAT
13	INFORMATION. I THINK EVERYBODY WILL LEARN A LOT
14	ABOUT THE DERIVATION OF THE MODERNA VACCINE, ABOUT
15	THE OTHER APPLICABILITIES, HOW IT'S POISED TO
16	REVOLUTIONIZE FLU VACCINES AS WELL AMONG OTHER
17	THINGS, AND MANY OTHER ASPECTS.
18	AND I WANTED TO CONGRATULATE DR. MILLAN ON
19	AN EXCELLENT JOB ON THAT INTERVIEW. AND WE WILL
20	CIRCULATE THE YOUTUBE LINK. IT'S WELL WORTH YOUR
21	TIME IF YOU HAVE A MOMENT TO WATCH. I THINK YOU'LL
22	ENJOY IT VERY MUCH.
23	DR. MILLAN, CONGRATULATIONS. IT WAS
24	EXCELLENT.
25	DR. MILLAN: I WANT TO THANK THE
	4
	l

	DETH C. DRAIN, CA CSK NO. / 152
1	COMMUNICATIONS TEAM FOR SETTING IT UP, MARIA
2	BONNEVILLE, KEVIN MCCORMACK. THEY DID A GREAT JOB.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. SO, MARIA,
4	HAVING SAID THAT, WILL YOU CALL THE ROLL.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. DAN BERNAL.
6	MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
8	DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
10	DR. BOXER: PRESENT.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.
12	DR. BRASHEAR: HERE.
13	MS. BONNEVILE: DEBORAH DEAS.
14	DR. DEAS: HERE.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
16	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
18	MS. DURON: HERE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
20	DR. GASSON: HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
22	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YO.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
24	DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
	5
	J

133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864 208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM

	DETH G. DIAMIN, CA GSK NO. 7 132
1	MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
3	DR. MALKAS: HERE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
5	DR. MARTIN: HERE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
7	DR. MELMED: HERE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
9	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
11	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
13	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
15	DR. PRIETO: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
17	DR. QUINT: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
19	MR. ROWLETT: HERE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
21	DR. SANDMEYER: HERE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
23	DR. STEWARD: HERE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
	6
	6

i	
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
2	MR. TORRES: HERE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
4	DR. VUORI: HERE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
6	KEITH YAMAMOTO.
7	DR. YAMAMOTO: HERE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE HAVE ALMOST A FULL
9	HOUSE. THAT'S FANTASTIC.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OUTSTANDING. THANK YOU,
11	EVERYBODY, FOR BEING HERE. THIS WILL BE, I THINK, A
12	MOST INTERESTING SESSION. THEY ALL ARE, BUT THIS IS
13	PARTICULARLY SO.
14	SO OUR FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS IS WE HAVE
15	A NEW MEMBER OF THE BOARD, WHICH IS LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
16	WE NEED TO, LARRY, SWEAR YOU IN. SO IF YOU COULD
17	RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND AND REPEAT AFTER ME PLEASE.
18	(DR. GOLDSTEIN WAS THEN DULY SWORN IN
19	AS A MEMBER OF THE ICOC.)
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CONGRATULATIONS. YOU
21	ARE NOW OFFICIALLY A MEMBER OF THE ICOC.
22	DR. GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU, J.T.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT OATH, VERY
24	INTERESTING. WE JUST HEARD THAT LAST WEEK PRETTY
25	MUCH. LARRY, IT'S ALWAYS CUSTOMARY WHEN NEW BOARD
	7

1	MEMBERS JOIN TO HAVE THEM SAY A FEW WORDS ABOUT
2	THEMSELVES. SO IF YOU WOULD DO THAT BY WAY OF
3	INTRODUCTION TO THE REST OF THE BOARD.
4	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES. I PRIMARILY HAVE
5	BEEN IN THE PAST A LAB SCIENTIST WITH A GROUP THAT
6	USED STEM CELLS TO DEVELOP MODELS OF ALZHEIMER'S
7	DISEASE IN A DISH AND TO SEARCH FOR DRUGS, ONE OF
8	WHICH WE'RE ABOUT TO PUT INTO CLINICAL TRIALS. I'M
9	A DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AT UC SAN DIEGO IN TWO
10	DEPARTMENTS, CELL AND MOLECULAR MEDICINE AND
11	NEUROSCIENCES. I ALSO WAS THE FOUNDING DIRECTOR OF
12	THE UCSD STEM CELL PROGRAM, THE FOUNDING DIRECTOR OF
13	THE STANFORD STEM CELL CLINICAL CENTER, AND THE
14	FOUNDING SCIENTIFIC DIRECTOR OF THE SANFORD
15	CONSORTIUM FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, THE ONLY
16	POSITION THAT I'M RETAINING.
17	I ALSO HAVE AN APPOINTMENT AS THE SENIOR
18	ADVISOR FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH AND POLICY TO DAVID
19	BRENNER, WHO IS THE VICE CHANCELLOR OF HEALTH
20	SCIENCES AT UC SAN DIEGO. I'VE ALSO BEEN THE
21	CO-CHAIR OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD TO PROP 71
22	AND MORE RECENTLY PROP 14, BOTH OF WHICH WE ALL ARE
23	DELIGHTED TO KNOW HAVE BEEN PASSED. AND I GUESS I
24	WOULD JUST STRESS MY LONG HISTORY OF WORKING WITH
25	STEM CELLS IN THE LAB, AND I BRING THAT PERSPECTIVE

1	TO WHAT WE WILL DO. SO THAT'S IT, J.T.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS VERY MUCH, LARRY.
3	AND YOUR PERSPECTIVE WILL BE MOST WELCOME, AND WE
4	ARE VERY HAPPY TO HAVE YOU ABOARD. SO THANK YOU FOR
5	YOUR INTEREST, AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH
6	YOU.
7	OKAY. WE'RE GOING ON TO ACTION ITEMS NOW,
8	THE FIRST OF WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT
9	OF MEMBERS TO THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY
10	WORKING GROUP. AS YOU MAY RECALL, AT OUR LAST
11	MEETING WE MENTIONED THAT ART AND MARIA BONNEVILLE
12	AND I ARE IN THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING APPOINTMENTS
13	TO THAT BODY. I'M GOING TO READ A VERY BRIEF COUPLE
14	OF PARAGRAPHS HERE TO THE BOARD JUST TO GIVE YOU A
15	BACKGROUND ON TODAY'S APPOINTEE.
16	AS YOU KNOW, PROP 14 CREATED THE
17	TREATMENTS AND CURES ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY
18	WORKING GROUP OR THE AAWG TO RECOMMEND POLICIES AND
19	PROGRAMS TO THE BOARD TO ENHANCE ACCESS TO AND THE
20	AFFORDABILITY OF TREATMENTS AND CURES ARISING FROM
21	CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH FOR CALIFORNIA PATIENTS.
22	THE AAWG IS COMPRISED OF 17 MEMBERS:
23	SEVEN MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, INCLUDING THE CHAIR AND
24	VICE CHAIR, AND TEN OUTSIDE EXPERTS. PURSUANT TO
25	HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE YOU CAN TELL THIS PART IS

1	FROM JAMES SECTION 125290.75 I EXPECT
2	EVERYBODY TO REMEMBER THAT THE CHAIR AND VICE
3	CHAIR OF THE BOARD ARE REQUIRED TO NOMINATE MEMBERS
4	OF THE AAWG FOR APPROVAL BY THE BOARD. TO DATE THE
5	BOARD HAS APPOINTED THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS TO
6	THE AAWG, WHICH YOU WILL RECALL FROM OUR DECEMBER
7	MEETING, THOSE BEING DAN BERNAL, ALLISON BRASHEAR,
8	DAVID HIGGINS, ADRIANA PADILLA, AND AL ROWLETT.
9	IN ADDITION, THE BOARD APPOINTED JAMES
10	DEBENEDETTI, THE DIRECTOR OF PLAN MANAGEMENT OF
11	COVERED CALIFORNIA, WHO FILLS THE SEAT FOR AN EXPERT
12	IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC INSURANCE PROGRAM.
13	WE NOW WISH TO NOMINATE DANA L. DORNSIFE,
14	THE FOUNDER AND CEO OF THE LAZAREX CANCER FOUNDATION
15	TO FILL THE SEAT FOR A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE
16	PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATION WHO HAS EXPERIENCE
17	ASSISTING PATIENTS IN CLINICAL TRIAL ACCESS AND
18	AFFORDABILITY OR WITH ACCESS TO AND THE
19	AFFORDABILITY OF INNOVATIVE THERAPIES.
20	AS THE FOUNDER AND CEO, MS. DORNSIFE HAS
21	WORKED TO IMPROVE THE OUTCOME OF CANCER CARE, GIVING
22	HOPE, DIGNITY, AND LIFE TO ADVANCED STAGE CANCER
23	PATIENTS AND THE MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED BY PROVIDING
24	ASSISTANCE WITH COSTS FOR FDA CLINICAL TRIAL
25	PARTICIPATION, IDENTIFICATION OF CLINICAL TRIAL

1	OPTIONS, COMMUNITY OUTREACH, AND ENGAGEMENT.
2	EVERYBODY, THE COPY OF MS. DORNSIFE'S CV
3	IS POSTED ON THE WEBSITE. AND SO, WITH THAT, WOULD
4	LIKE TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO FORMALLY APPOINT DANA
5	DORNSIFE TO THE AAWG. DO I HEAR A MOTION TO THAT
6	EFFECT?
7	MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY SENATOR TORRES.
9	DR. PRIETO: SECOND.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY FRANCISCO.
11	IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
12	MR. TORRES: YES. I WANTED TO ADD A FEW
13	ELEMENTS TO DANA'S RESUME. HER PHILANTHROPIC
14	CONTRIBUTIONS ARE STATEWIDE. SHE'S ON THE
15	PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL AT UCSF. SHE'S ALSO A USC BRAIN
16	AND CREATIVITY INSTITUTE BOARD MEMBER FOR MANY
17	YEARS, SINCE 2008, QUITE FRANKLY. AND SHE'S AN
18	EXCELLENT PUBLIC SPEAKER, WHICH I THINK WILL BE TO
19	OUR ADVANTAGE AS WE MOVE FORWARD TO EDUCATE THE
20	PUBLIC ABOUT THE AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY OF
21	OUR FUTURE TREATMENTS, WHICH I'M VERY MUCH LOOKING
22	FORWARD TO, AND I THINK SHE WOULD BE A TREMENDOUS
23	ASSET TO OUR WORK AND TO OUR VISION.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, SENATOR
25	TORRES. ARE THERE OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE

DETH G. DIMIN, GA CON NO. 7 132
BOARD? HEARING NONE, ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS?
HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
MR. BERNAL: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
DR. BOXER: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.
DR. BRASHEAR: YES.
MS. BONNEVILE: DEBORAH DEAS.
DR. DEAS: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
DR. DULIEGE: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
MS. DURON: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
DR. GASSON: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
DR. HIGGINS: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
12

	DETH G. DIAMIN, CA GSK NO. 7 132
1	DR. MALKAS: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
3	DR. MARTIN: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
5	DR. MELMED: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
7	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
9	DR. PADILLA: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
11	MR. PANETTA: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
13	DR. PRIETO: AYE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
15	DR. QUINT: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
17	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
19	DR. SANDMEYER: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
21	DR. STEWARD: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
25	MR. TORRES: AYE.
	13

133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864 208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
2	DR. VUORI: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
4	KEITH YAMAMOTO.
5	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. JUST
8	FOR THE BENEFIT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, ART, MARIA,
9	AND I HAVE BEEN TALKING TO A NUMBER OF OTHER
10	POTENTIAL APPOINTEES TO THE AAWG AND WILL HAVE MORE
11	ON THAT AT OUR NEXT BOARD MEETING.
12	OKAY. WE GO ON TO ITEM NO. 5,
13	CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF INTERIM CONFLICT OF
14	INTEREST POLICY FOR ADVISORY TASK FORCES. THIS IS
15	AN ITEM THAT JAMES WILL LEAD. JAMES.
16	MR. HARRISON: BEAR WITH ME FOR ONE MOMENT
17	WHILE I SHARE MY SCREEN.
18	GOOD MORNING, BOARD MEMBERS, MEMBERS OF
19	THE CIRM TEAM, AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. WE ARE
20	HERE TODAY TO DISCUSS ONE NEW FEATURE OF PROP 14
21	WHICH IS A PROVISION THAT AUTHORIZES THE CHAIR AND
22	THE PRESIDENT TO ESTABLISH ADVISORY TASK FORCES TO
23	ADVISE THE BOARD ON MATTERS WITHIN CIRM'S
24	JURISDICTION, SUCH AS SCIENTIFIC MATTERS, ETHICAL,
25	TECHNICAL, AND FINANCIAL MATTERS.

1	AS THE NAME IMPLIES, THESE TASK FORCES ARE
2	ADVISORY ONLY. THEY ARE NOT INVOLVED IN MAKING ANY
3	DECISIONS; AND THEY, IN FACT, ARE EXPRESSLY
4	PROHIBITED FROM REVIEWING OR COMMENTING UPON ANY
5	APPLICATION FOR FUNDING. SO UNDER STATE LAW AS WELL
6	AS UNDER PROP 14, THEY'RE NOT SUBJECT TO THE STATE
7	CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS. BUT BECAUSE WE OBVIOUSLY
8	HAVE AN INTEREST IN ENSURING THAT THE ADVICE WE GET
9	IS FREE FROM BIAS, PROP 14 REQUIRES CIRM TO ADOPT
10	CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES SIMILAR TO THE WORKING
11	GROUP RULES TO GOVERN MEMBERS OF ADVISORY TASK
12	FORCES.
13	AS J.T. NOTED, I DO LIKE TO CITE MY CODE
14	SECTIONS. AND AS YOU WILL SEE HERE, ONE FEATURE OF
15	PROP 71 AUTHORIZES CIRM TO ADOPT INTERIM
16	REGULATIONS. SO TYPICALLY REGULATIONS HAVE TO GO
17	THROUGH A LENGTHY PROCESS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE
18	PROCEDURE ACT BEFORE THEY TAKE EFFECT. BUT IN
19	RECOGNITION OF THE FACT THAT CIRM HAS AN URGENT
20	MISSION, PROP 71 AUTHORIZED THE BOARD TO ADOPT
21	INTERIM REGULATIONS TO TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY AND
22	TO REMAIN IN EFFECT FOR 270 DAYS UNLESS EARLIER
23	SUPERSEDED BY A REGULATION ADOPTED PURSUANT TO THE
24	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT.
25	THIS IS IMPORTANT FOR US IN THIS CASE

1	BECAUSE THE CHAIR AND PRESIDENT MILLAN WOULD LIKE TO
2	MOVE FORWARD WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADVISORY
3	TASK FORCE TO ADVISE THEM ON SCIENTIFIC MATTERS. SO
4	WE NEED TO ENSURE THAT CONFLICT RULES ARE IN PLACE
5	BEFORE THAT ADVISORY GROUP IS CONVENED.
6	SO WE ARE HERE TODAY TO REQUEST THAT THE
7	BOARD ADOPT PROPOSED INTERIM CONFLICT RULES FOR THE
8	ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS. THESE RULES ARE MODELED ON
9	THE WORKING GROUP CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES WHICH
10	PROP 71 SPECIFIES ARE BASED ON NIH RULES. PROP 14
11	SUPPLEMENTS THAT BY REQUIRING THE BOARD TO REVIEW
12	THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES TO SEEK ALIGNMENT
13	FROM CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES ADOPTED BY THE
14	NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. SO THE RULES WE'VE
15	PROPOSED TODAY RELY ON BOTH NIH AS WELL AS NATIONAL
16	ACADEMY OF SCIENCES CONFLICT STANDARDS.
17	THEY REQUIRE BOTH DISQUALIFICATION
18	DISCLOSURE AND A PROHIBITION. AS YOU WILL SEE,
19	MEMBERS UNDER THE PROPOSED RULE WOULD BE PROHIBITED
20	FROM DERIVING ANY DIRECT FINANCING BENEFIT THROUGH A
21	CIRM AWARD EITHER AS A RESULT OF ACTING AS A PI ON
22	AN AWARD OR AS AN INVESTIGATOR ON A TEAM.
23	THE RULES WOULD ALSO REQUIRE DISCLOSURE BY
24	MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY TASK FORCE FOCUSED ON THE
25	TYPES OF INTERESTS THAT MIGHT BE AT ISSUE GIVEN THE

1	FACT THEY'RE NOT REVIEWING SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS.
2	SO THIS WOULD INCLUDE INCOME OF \$5,000 OR MORE
3	RECEIVED FROM AN ACADEMIC OR NONPROFIT RESEARCH
4	INSTITUTION LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA IN THE LAST 12
5	MONTHS, INVESTMENTS OF \$5,000 OR MORE HELD BY THE
6	MEMBER OR HIS OR HER SPOUSE IN PUBLIC BIOTECHNOLOGY
7	AND PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES THAT ARE PRIMARILY
8	FOCUSED ON STEM CELL OR GENETIC RESEARCH AND THERAPY
9	DEVELOPMENT. AND MEMBERS WOULD BE REQUIRED TO
10	DISQUALIFY THEMSELVES IF ONE OF THEIR FINANCIAL
11	INTERESTS WAS INVOLVED IN A DECISION BEFORE THE TASK
12	FORCE UNLESS, SIMILAR TO NIH RULES, THE PRESIDENT OF
13	CIRM WERE TO MAKE THE DETERMINATION THAT THE NEED
14	FOR THE MEMBER'S EXPERTISE OUTWEIGHED ANY POSSIBLE
15	BIAS RESULTING FROM THE MEMBER'S INTEREST.
16	SO WE WOULD REQUEST BY MOTION YOU APPROVE
17	THE INTERIM CONFLICT OF INTEREST RULES FOR MEMBERS
18	OF THE ADVISORY TASK FORCE AND AUTHORIZE THE CIRM
19	TEAM TO INITIATE A RULEMAKING TO ADOPT THESE RULES
20	AS PERMANENT REGULATIONS PURSUANT TO THE
21	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT. I'LL TURN IT BACK TO
22	YOU.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES. DO I
24	HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?
25	MS. DURON: SO MOVED.

	DETH G. DIMHN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY MS. DURON. IS
2	THERE A SECOND?
3	DR. YAMAMOTO: SECOND.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECOND BY DR. YAMAMOTO.
5	IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I JUST WANTED TO
7	SAY THAT I REALLY APPRECIATE THIS CONFLICT OF
8	INTEREST PROPOSAL. I THINK THAT THE PUBLIC NEEDS TO
9	BE REASSURED THAT WE HAVE KEPT THE INTEREST OF THE
10	PUBLIC AND PATIENTS AT HEART, THAT THIS IS NOT ABOUT
11	SELF-INVESTMENT. I THINK THEY'RE ALSO BECOMING MUCH
12	MORE UNDERSTANDING ABOUT THESE ISSUES. THEY'RE MUCH
13	MORE THEY CARE MUCH MORE ABOUT THESE KINDS OF
14	ISSUES, AND I THINK THAT IT'S GOOD THAT WE AT THIS
15	STAGE GET AHEAD OF THE CURVE AND RECOGNIZE THAT OUR
16	DUTY IS TO THE PUBLIC AND FOR NO OTHER REASON ARE WE
17	HERE. THANK YOU.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. COMMENTS,
19	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? HEARING
20	NONE, ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA,
21	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
23	MR. BERNAL: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
25	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
	18

	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
2	DR. BOXER: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.
4	DR. BRASHEAR: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILE: DEBORAH DEAS.
6	DR. DEAS: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
8	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
10	MS. DURON: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
12	DR. GASSON: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
14	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
16	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
18	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
20	DR. MALKAS: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
22	DR. MARTIN: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
24	DR. MELMED: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
	19

	,
1	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
3	DR. PADILLA: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
5	MR. PANETTA: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
7	DR. PRIETO: AYE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT. AL
9	ROWLETT.
10	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
12	DR. SANDMEYER: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
14	DR. STEWARD: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18	MR. TORRES: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
20	DR. VUORI: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
22	KEITH YAMAMOTO.
23	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
25	THANK YOU.
	20
	20

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. OKAY.
2	SO THAT CONCLUDES OUR BRIEF ACTION ITEM LIST. WE
3	ARE NOW GETTING TO SORT OF THE MAIN TOPIC FOR
4	TODAY'S BOARD MEETING.
5	AS YOU KNOW AND AS WE HAVE DISCUSSED AND
6	SEEN IN PREVIOUS WRITE-UPS FROM JAMES, PROP 14 HAS A
7	NUMBER OF ELEMENTS IN IT THAT BUILD ON THOSE IN PROP
8	71 AND ADD TO THEM AND/OR INTRODUCE NEW PROGRAMS TO
9	BE IMPLEMENTED UNDER THE TERMS OF THE INITIATIVE.
10	WE WANTED TO DEVOTE MOST OF THIS MEETING TO A REVIEW
11	OF THE NEW ELEMENTS IN PROP 14 AND TO HAVE THE BOARD
12	GET A CHANCE TO HAVE ITS FIRST INPUT ON THOSE NEW
13	ELEMENTS. ALL OF THIS IS IN A CONTINUUM OF
14	DISCUSSIONS THAT THE BOARD IS HAVING WITH DR. MILLAN
15	AND THE TEAM TOWARDS DEVELOPING THE STRATEGIC PLAN
16	FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.
17	SO THE FORMAT FOR THIS IS GOING TO BE
18	JAMES HAS PREPARED A PRESENTATION ON THE NEW
19	ELEMENTS OF PROP 14, AND HE'S GOING TO GO THROUGH
20	IT. AND AS HE INTRODUCES EACH NEW CONCEPT, WE WILL
21	PAUSE AND HAVE A CHANCE FOR THE BOARD TO COMMENT AND
22	DISCUSS. THIS WILL NOT BY ANY MEANS BE THE LAST
23	OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO. AS YOU KNOW, AMONG OTHER
24	THINGS, IN MARCH WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A BOARD RETREAT
25	IN WHICH WE'LL GET INTO THESE AND OTHER ITEMS IN
	31

1	MORE DETAIL. BUT I THOUGHT THIS WAS A VERY GOOD
2	OPPORTUNITY FOR THE BOARD TO SORT OF GET A
3	FIRST-BLUSH LOOK AT THE CHANGES IN SOME DETAIL.
4	SO HAVING SAID THAT, JAMES IF YOU WOULD.
5	MR. HARRISON: SHARE MY SCREEN AND ADD
6	THAT DR. MILLAN, FOLLOWING MY PRESENTATION, WILL
7	OFFER THE CIRM TEAM'S INITIAL THOUGHTS ON SOME OF
8	THE NEW PROGRAMS THAT I'LL BE HIGHLIGHTING TODAY.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, IF I CAN JUST ADD
10	BEFORE YOU GET TO YOUR PRESENTATION, ONCE JAMES HAS
11	GONE THROUGH THE PRESENTATION, DR. MILLAN WILL HAVE
12	COMMENTS ON A NUMBER OF THE ELEMENTS IN THERE FOR
13	FURTHER DISCUSSION. SO WE WILL DO THOSE IN
14	SEQUENCE. SO THANK YOU, JAMES.
15	MR. HARRISON: THANKS FOR BEARING WITH ME
16	AS I DEAL WITH ZOOM AND SCREEN SHARING.
17	GOOD MORNING ONCE AGAIN. AS J.T. SAID,
18	TODAY I WILL WALK YOU THROUGH SOME OF THE MAJOR
19	CHANGES RESULTING FROM PROP 14. BUT BEFORE I BEGIN,
20	I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO SET THE CONTEXT BECAUSE,
21	AS DR. GOLDSTEIN AND J.T. HAVE MENTIONED, OBVIOUSLY
22	PROP 14 BUILDS ON AN INCREDIBLE FOUNDATION
23	ESTABLISHED BY PROP 71, WHICH CALIFORNIA VOTERS
24	APPROVED, 16 YEARS AGO NOW, OVERWHELMINGLY IN
25	NOVEMBER OF 2004. AND I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY THAT

1	PROP 71 IS THE INFRASTRUCTURE UPON WHICH PROP 14 WAS
2	BUILT. AND MANY OF THE ELEMENTS OF PROP 14, WITH
3	ONE SIGNIFICANT EXCEPTION, EXPAND UPON PROGRAMS THAT
4	CIRM INITIATED UNDER PROP 71.
5	AS YOU ALL KNOW, THOUGH IT WAS A CLOSE
6	ELECTION, MORE THAN 8.5 MILLION CALIFORNIA VOTERS
7	APPROVED PROP 14 AND AUTHORIZED \$5.5 BILLION IN
8	ADDITIONAL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDING FOR CIRM
9	OPERATIONS AND AWARDS.
10	THE MEASURE MAKES BOTH SUBSTANTIVE AND
11	TECHNICAL CHANGES TO PROP 71. INCLUDED WITH THE
12	AGENDA PACKET TODAY IS AN ANNOTATED COPY OF THE
13	INITIATIVE IN WHICH I TRIED TO HIGHLIGHT THESE
14	CHANGES IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REVIEW THEM YOURSELVES.
15	IT DOES IMPOSE SOME NEW REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO
16	THE ALLOCATION OF THE \$5.5 BILLION IT AUTHORIZES,
17	WHICH I WILL HIGHLIGHT. AND AS I SAID, MANY OF YOU
18	WILL RECOGNIZE SOME OF THE ELEMENTS OF PROP 14
19	BECAUSE THEY SPRING FROM PROGRAMS THAT THE CIRM
20	BOARD HAS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED.
21	I'M JUST GOING TO HIGHLIGHT THE MOST
22	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES AND THEN WALK THROUGH EACH OF
23	THEM IN A LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL. AS I SAID, IT
24	ESTABLISHES NEW PROGRAMS, AND YOU WILL RECOGNIZE
25	MANY OF THEM. THE ONE SIGNIFICANT NEW PROGRAM THAT

1	PROP 14 ESTABLISHES THAT WAS NOT A PART OF PROP 71
2	IS A FOURTH WORKING GROUP. AS YOU KNOW, CIRM HAS
3	HAD THE BENEFIT OF OUTSIDE EXPERTISE AND THE EFFORTS
4	OF PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WHO HAVE
5	SERVED ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, ALL OF WHICH YOU
6	ARE FAMILIAR WITH. CIRM ALSO HAD THE BENEFIT OF THE
7	FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, WHICH MADE RECOMMENDATIONS
8	WITH RESPECT TO FACILITIES AWARDS, AND THE STANDARDS
9	WORKING GROUP, WHICH HAS WORKED DILIGENTLY TO ENSURE
10	THAT CIRM ADOPTS THE HIGHEST ETHICAL STANDARDS TO
11	GOVERN THE RESEARCH IT FUNDS.
12	PROP 14 ESTABLISHES A NEW WORKING GROUP
13	WHICH IT CALLS THE TREATMENTS AND CURES
14	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP TO
15	FOCUS, AS THE NAME SUGGESTS, ON ISSUES OF
16	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY BOTH TO CLINICAL
17	TRIALS AS WELL AS TO TREATMENTS AND CURES THAT ARISE
18	FROM CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH.
19	PROP 14 ALSO EXPANDS THE SCOPE OF WHAT
20	CIRM CAN FUND, WHICH I WILL DISCUSS IN MORE DETAIL.
21	IMPORTANTLY, THE MEASURE SPECIFICALLY EARMARKS NO
22	LESS THAN \$1.5 BILLION FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING
23	DISEASES AND CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN AND CENTRAL
24	NERVOUS SYSTEM. THIS IS A BIT OF A DEPARTURE FROM
25	PROP 71 WHICH DID NOT EARMARK FUNDING FOR ANY

1	SPECIFIC DISEASE OR CONDITION, BUT THE \$1.5 BILLION
2	IS A GOAL IN PROP 14 TO ENSURE THAT THESE CONDITIONS
3	RECEIVE THEIR FAIR SHARE OF RESEARCH FUNDING GIVEN
4	THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO ARE AFFECTED BY THEM.
5	PROP 14 ALSO EXPANDS THE SIZE OF THE BOARD
6	AND ALLOWS FOR REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBERS. IT MAKES
7	SOME SIGNIFICANT GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE
8	CHANGES. IT MAKES SOME CHANGES TO CIRM'S REVIEW
9	PROCESS. IT IMPOSES A NEW OBLIGATION ON THE BOARD
10	TO REVIEW ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS EVERY FOUR
11	YEARS AND REQUIRES THE ADOPTION OF CERTAIN NEW
12	STANDARDS.
13	THE \$5.5 BILLION IS ALLOCATED PURSUANT TO
14	A RELATIVELY COMPLEX FORMULA, DESIGNATING THE FUNDS
15	FOR RESEARCH, ADMINISTRATION, AND FACILITIES. IT
16	INCLUDES SOME IMPORTANT BOND TERMS THAT I'LL
17	DISCUSS. AND THEN, FINALLY, ONE OF THE SIGNIFICANT
18	CHANGES IT MAKES IS TO EARMARK ROYALTIES THAT ARISE
19	FROM CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH FOR ACCESS AND
20	AFFORDABILITY.
21	LET ME TOUCH BRIEFLY ON THE NEW PROGRAMS
22	THAT PROP 14 CREATES. AS YOU ALL KNOW, CIRM
23	CURRENTLY HAS AN ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS PROGRAM
24	WITH FIVE FUNDED CENTERS. PROP 14 REQUIRES THE
25	EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINIC PROGRAM IN

1	AN EFFORT TO ENHANCE ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS AND
2	TREATMENTS. IT ALSO ESTABLISHES WHAT IT CALLS
3	COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND REQUIRES
4	CIRM TO MAKE AWARDS IN THIS AREA, AGAIN, TO ENHANCE
5	ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS AND TREATMENTS WITH AN
6	EMPHASIS ON GEOGRAPHICALLY DIVERSE CENTERS,
7	RECOGNIZING THAT THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS ARE
8	LOCATED NEAR MAJOR POPULATION AREAS WHICH ARE
9	DIFFICULT FOR SOME PATIENTS IN MORE REMOTE AREAS OF
LO	THE STATE TO ACCESS.
L1	APPROPRIATELY ENOUGH, GIVEN CHAIRMAN
L2	THOMAS' COMMENTS EARLIER
L3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, COULD I JUST STOP
L4	YOU FOR ONE SECOND. I'D LIKE TO KIND OF TAKE THESE
L5	THINGS IN TURN IF WE COULD BECAUSE IT WOULD BE A
L6	LITTLE DIFFICULT TO COME BACK AFTER YOU'VE GONE
L7	THROUGH YOUR WHOLE PRESENTATION HERE. SO I BEG MY
L8	INDULGENCE HERE.
L9	I WILL NOTE THAT THE COMMUNITY CARE
20	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, THIS IS GOING TO BE SOMETHING
21	THAT THE BOARD IS GOING TO TALK A LOT ABOUT AS THE
22	PLANS FOR IT ARE BEING DEVELOPED. BUT I WANTED TO
23	SEE IF THERE ARE ANY PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ANYBODY ON
24	THE BOARD HAS WITH RESPECT TO EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA
25	STEM CELL CLINIC PROGRAM OR ANY PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS

1	ON COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS, PARTICULARLY AS THEY SEEK
2	TO GET ACCESS TO THE UNDERSERVED IN THE STATE.
3	WE HAVE COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
4	ON EITHER OF THESE ITEMS?
5	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK IT'S
6	REALLY CRUCIAL THAT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
7	COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS, WE BE ABLE TO REVIEW THE
8	PLANS AND KNOW MAYBE AND EVEN HEAR FROM PEOPLE FROM
9	THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS AND THEIR ENGAGEMENT IN
10	THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITIES SO WE KNOW THAT THEY ARE IN
11	FACT REFLECTING THE CONCERNS AND THE NEEDS OF THOSE
12	LOCAL COMMUNITIES, THAT THEY'RE GEOGRAPHICALLY
13	PINPOINTED, THAT THEY UNDERSTAND THE DEMOGRAPHICS OF
14	THAT AREA, THAT THEY UNDERSTAND ISSUES THAT THOSE
15	AREAS MIGHT BE FACING, AND THAT THEY'RE VERY
16	SENSITIVE TO THAT, AND THAT THERE ARE SPOKESMEN FROM
17	THOSE LOCAL AREAS THAT HAVE INPUT INTO BOTH THE
18	DEVELOPMENT AS WELL AS THE UTILIZATION OF THIS
19	PROGRAM. I THINK IT'S REALLY CRUCIAL. THEY COULD
20	BRING THE PUBLIC AND THE TAXPAYER BACK INTO THE
21	SOLUTION AND THE RECOGNITION THAT THIS IS THERE
22	TRULY TO HELP THEM AND SERVE THEM.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THAT SORT OF
24	RAISES A LARGER CONCEPT WHICH IS, AS THESE NEW
25	PROGRAMS ARE BEING DISCUSSED AND DEVELOPED, WE, AS

1	ALWAYS, WILL SEEK STAKEHOLDER INPUT FOR WHATEVER THE
2	PROGRAM MIGHT BE. AS MS. DURON JUST INDICATED, THIS
3	WOULD BE A PRIME EXAMPLE. SO WE WILL WELCOME INPUT
4	IN WHOMEVER WOULD LIKE TO ADVISE ON THIS MATTER AS
5	ALL OF THAT WILL HELP INFORM US HOW WE PROCEED FROM
6	HERE.
7	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
8	MR. ROWLETT: MY COMMENT IS TO ENDORSE
9	WHAT YOU JUST SAID. AND PRIOR TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF
10	A PLAN, MY INPUT WOULD BE THAT YOU SOLICIT
11	STAKEHOLDERS THAT REPRESENT THE CONSTITUENTS OF OUR
12	STATE AND OUR BOARD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN. I
13	THINK THAT IT ADVANCES THE GOALS OF THE PROPOSITION,
14	AND IT REALLY DOES SUPPORT THE IMPORTANCE OF
15	TRANSPARENCY IN THIS VERY IMPORTANT PROCESS IN
16	SERVING THE UNSERVED AND THOSE WHO ARE NOT SERVED AS
17	WELL IN OUR STATE. SO THANK YOU FOR SAYING THAT.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MR. ROWLETT.
19	OTHER COMMENTS?
20	DR. DEAS: YES. AS IT RELATES TO THE
21	COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, I'M JUST
22	WONDERING IF THIS WILL BE INITIATED AT THE LEVEL
23	WHERE WE HAVE THESE GEOGRAPHICALLY DIVERSE
24	POPULATIONS, OR WILL IT BE INITIATED FROM THE
25	CURRENT ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS BECAUSE, AS WE LOOK

1	ACROSS THE STATE, THERE ARE LARGE POCKETS OF AREAS
2	WHICH DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO THESE CLINICAL TRIALS
3	AND TREATMENTS. AND, THEREFORE, WOULD THAT IDEA OR
4	THE CENTERS GERMINATE FROM THOSE AREAS, OR WOULD THE
5	ALPHA CLINIC REACH OUT TO COLLABORATE WITH THOSE
6	AREAS?
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
8	QUESTION, DR. DEAS. I THINK THE ANSWER TO THAT IS
9	THIS AIMS TO BE AND, JAMES, AT EVERY POINT PLEASE
10	STEP IN HERE AS ONE OF THE DRAFTERS OF THE MEASURE
11	AS TO SORT OF WHAT THE THOUGHT WAS ON QUESTIONS LIKE
12	THIS. BUT THE OBJECT OF THIS, I THINK, IS TO CREATE
13	SORT OF A STATEWIDE INTEGRATED WHOLE PROGRAM THAT
14	FEATURES BOTH THE ALPHA CLINICS AND THE COMMUNITY
15	CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE THAT WORK IN AN
16	INTEGRATED FASHION. AS RESPECTS WHO THE DRIVING
17	FORCE IS GOING TO BE BEHIND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
18	COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE
19	NEED TO DISCUSS. BUT THE END RESULT IS TO HAVE THIS
20	SORT OF SEAMLESS NETWORK THROUGHOUT THE STATE THAT
21	ACCESSES EVERYBODY WHO NEEDS ATTENTION.
22	SO, JAMES, DO YOU HAVE A THOUGHT ON THIS?
23	MR. HARRISON: I THINK THAT'S AN ACCURATE
24	WAY TO DESCRIBE IT, J.T. THE LANGUAGE OF THE
25	STATUTE IS NOT PRESCRIPTIVE, DR. DEAS. SO THERE IS
	20

1	A FAIR AMOUNT OF LATITUDE THAT CIRM HAS IN DESIGNING
2	A PROGRAM TO SERVE THE GOALS OF PATIENTS ACROSS THE
3	STATE.
4	THE REAL KIND OF DRIVING CRITERIA HERE IS
5	TO TRY TO ACCOMPLISH GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY.
6	DR. DEAS: RIGHT. AND I THINK THAT IS
7	REALLY KEY, THAT WE HAVE A NETWORK AND ESTABLISH
8	WHERE THESE REGIONS OR WHERE THE CENTERS SHOULD BE.
9	OTHERWISE, WE CAN INADVERTENTLY AND UNINTENTIONALLY
10	PERPETUATE DISPARITIES IF WE JUST WAIT FOR ALPHA
11	CENTERS TO DETERMINE WHERE THEY WANT TO COLLABORATE
12	TO INCREASE ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS. IF WE GO
13	AHEAD WITH THAT NETWORK MAP OUT IN THE STATE WHERE
14	WE HAVE THESE DISPARITIES WHERE PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE
15	ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS AND TREATMENTS, AND SAY WE
16	NEED COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS IN THIS AREA, THAT AREA,
17	WHATEVER. AND THEN THE ALPHA CENTERS WILL NEED TO
18	COLLABORATE WITH THOSE AREAS TO RAISE UP THOSE
19	COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE. OTHERWISE, WE
20	MAY HAVE SOME UNINTENTIONAL CONSEQUENCES.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THAT'S A
22	VERY IMPORTANT POINT.
23	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
24	MR. TORRES: YES, IF I MAY. WHEN WE WERE
25	DRAFTING THIS LANGUAGE, BECAUSE I PARTICIPATED IN
	20

1	THE AFFORDABILITY ACCESSIBILITY WORKING GROUP
2	ESPECIALLY, BECAUSE I FELT THAT IS VERY, VERY
3	IMPORTANT, AND JAMES AND BOB REALLY PUT IT FORWARD,
4	BUT WHAT I ALSO FOUND OUT DURING THE CAMPAIGN, ON MY
5	OWN TIME, NOT AT STATE EXPENSE, I WAS ABLE TO
6	RECEIVE IN THE TRAVELS VIA ZOOM AND COMMUNICATION
7	WITH PEOPLE AS TO THE NEED, AS DEAN DEAS HAS
8	INDICATED, FOR GEOGRAPHIC REDISTRIBUTION. IN OTHER
9	WORDS, THE LACK OF ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY
10	TO SERVICES AND ULTIMATELY OUR TREATMENTS ARE GOING
11	TO BE ALIGNED IN THE SAME WAY THAT WE HAVE DENIED
12	ACCESSIBILITY TO RURAL CALIFORNIA, WHICH INCLUDES A
13	LOT OF FARM WORKERS AND AFRICAN-AMERICANS, TO THE
14	INLAND EMPIRE, WHICH, AGAIN, INCLUDES A LARGE
15	POPULATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN AND LATINO RESIDENTS,
16	AND OBVIOUSLY TO THE COACHELLA VALLEY AND IMPERIAL
17	COUNTY. SO THOSE FOR THE UNDERSERVED, SOME, NOT
18	ALL, THERE ARE MANY OTHERS IN FAR NORTHERN
19	CALIFORNIAN, AND THE POOR WHITE AREAS OF OUR STATE,
20	THAT WE NEED TO BE SENSITIVE TO. AND THE WHOLE
21	PURPOSE OF THESE COMMUNITY CARE CLINICS WAS TO
22	ENHANCE WHAT ALREADY EXISTS. IN OTHER WORDS, NOT
23	REPLICATE THE JURISDICTION OR THE REACH OF THE ALPHA
24	STEM CELL CLINICS, BUT REALLY TRULY TO DEVELOP NEW
25	INITIATIVES THAT WILL REACH OUT TO MAKE THE

1	TREATMENTS THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE. AND THAT STARTS
2	WITH THE CLINICAL TRIALS. THAT LEADS TO
3	AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY TO THE TREATMENTS
4	THAT MAY EMERGE FROM THOSE CLINICAL TRIALS AND THE
5	FDA. SO ALL OF THAT IS COMPOSITE.
6	SO I JUST APPRECIATE THE REMARKS THAT HAVE
7	BEEN MADE BY ALL OF YOU WHO HAVE SPOKEN AND JUST TO
8	REITERATE THAT WAS OUR INTENT WHEN WE PUT THIS
9	LANGUAGE IN HERE IN TERMS OF THE COMMUNITY CARE
10	CENTERS AND HOW WE CAN UTILIZE THAT VEHICLE FOR MORE
11	ACCESSIBILITY STATEWIDE.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, SENATOR
13	TORRES. I BELIEVE DR. BRASHEAR IS NEXT.
14	DR. BRASHEAR: I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT I
15	AGREE WITH THE COMMENTS OF DEBORAH DEAS AND SENATOR
16	TORRES. THIS IS A CHANCE TO PIVOT TOWARDS
17	INCLUSIVE, TRANSPARENT PROGRAMS OR HEALTH EQUITY.
18	ONE OF THE THINGS ABOUT THE CLINICAL TRIALS IS IT
19	MEANS THAT WE NEED TO GET OUT INTO THE COMMUNITY AND
20	BRING THESE TRIALS TO THEM RATHER THAN JUST WAITING
21	FOR PEOPLE TO COME TO THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS.
22	SO I THINK THIS IS A REALLY GREAT
23	INITIATIVE AND ONE THAT OVER THE NEXT COUPLE OF
24	YEARS WILL MEAN THAT OUR PATIENTS WHO MAY NOT BE
25	USED TO BEING IN CLINICAL TRIALS AND USED TO GETTING

1	THESE CUTTING-EDGE TREATMENTS WILL SEE THIS AS, NOT
2	ONLY SOMETHING THEY'RE INTERESTED IN, BUT ALMOST
3	COMMONPLACE FOR THEIR PARTICULAR DISEASES.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
5	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6	DR. PADILLA: I JUST WANTED TO COMMENT AND
7	AGREE WITH EVERYTHING THAT WAS SAID. FOR
8	TRANSPARENCY ISSUES, COULD THE NEW REGULATIONS ALSO
9	ALLOW FOR PERHAPS MAYBE A TRANSPARENT NEEDS ANALYSIS
10	SO THAT THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA POPULATIONS CAN BE
11	AWARE OF HOW THE DETERMINATION IS BEING MADE FOR
12	ESTABLISHING OUTREACH CENTERS THAT IS MORE EQUITABLE
13	TO BOTH THE LOCATION, THE FINANCIAL, AND THE ETHNIC
14	REPRESENTATION OF THE MEMBERS OF CALIFORNIA? SO
15	COULD WE DO A CALL FOR PROPOSALS TO DO A NEEDS
16	ANALYSIS FOR WHERE THESE NEW CENTERS MIGHT BE
17	LOCATED?
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S A VERY
19	INTERESTING SUGGESTION, DR. PADILLA. LET'S FURTHER
20	DISCUSS THAT. I THINK ALL OF THESE COMMENTS ARE
21	GETTING AT IDENTIFYING THE AREAS THAT MANDATE
22	ATTENTION IS SPOT ON AND DIRECTLY UNDERLIES THE
23	WHOLE IDEA OF THIS NEW PROGRAM. SO WE'LL
24	INCORPORATE ALL THESE COMMENTS AND HAVE FURTHER
25	DISCUSSION ON THE BEST WAY TO GO ABOUT MAKING SURE

1	THAT HAPPENS.
2	DR. SANDMEYER.
3	DR. SANDMEYER: COULD MAYBE ART COMMENT A
4	LITTLE BIT ON WHETHER THERE'S ANY KIND OF A
5	CONNECTION THAT'S FORMALIZED BETWEEN THE CENTERS OF
6	EXCELLENCE AND THE AFFORDABILITY AND ACCESS GRANT
7	PROGRAM?
8	MR. TORRES: THE QUESTION AGAIN?
9	DR. SANDMEYER: JUST WHETHER THERE WAS
10	IMAGINED TO BE FORMAL CONNECTION BETWEEN THE GRANT
11	PROGRAM FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY WHICH GETS
12	QUITE A BIT OF FUNDING AND THESE CENTERS OF
13	EXCELLENCE. SO IS THERE A LINK BETWEEN SORT OF THE
14	THREE POINTS OF THE TRIANGLE, IF YOU WILL, THE
15	CENTERS, THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS, AND THEN THESE
16	GRANTS? IS THAT FORMAL?
17	MR. TORRES: IT'S NOT FORMAL, BUT I THINK
18	IT WILL EVOLVE AS MARIA AND I PUT THE STRATEGY
19	TOGETHER FOR THE WORKING GROUP BECAUSE IT'S ALL
20	INVOLVED IN A GLOBAL APPROACH TO THIS ISSUE. AND SO
21	I THINK THAT'S GOING TO TAKE TIME AS WE FERRET OUT
22	THE PRIORITIES, BUT CLEARLY THERE HAS TO BE A
23	RELATIONSHIP, AS OUR DEAN FROM UC DAVIS SAID,
24	ESPECIALLY IN RESPECT TO CLINICAL TRIALS. AND WE
25	HAVE TO PROVIDE OUTREACH TO COMMUNITIES THAT AREN'T

1	GOING TO BE ABLE TO DRIVE TO L.A. OR OTHER PLACES
2	WHERE WE'VE HAD TRADITIONAL CLINICAL TRIALS SO THAT
3	THESE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OFFER THAT
4	AVAILABILITY.
5	DR. SANDMEYER: THANK YOU.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANY OTHER
7	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS ITEM?
8	OKAY. THANK YOU, EVERYBODY. I JUST NOTE FOR
9	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WHO ARE ON THE CALL HERE THAT
10	PUBLIC COMMENT WILL BE ENTERTAINED ON ALL OF THE
11	ELEMENTS FOLLOWING DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION AT THE
12	END OF MR. HARRISON'S PRESENTATION. SO, JAMES, ON
13	TO POINT NO. 2.
14	MR. HARRISON: THANKS, J.T.
15	THE SECOND NEW PROGRAM THAT PROP 14
16	ESTABLISHES OR MORE APPROPRIATELY REESTABLISHES ARE
17	TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS. AS SOME OF YOU
18	KNOW AND AS DR. PRIETO AND DR. STEWARD WILL RECALL,
19	THE VERY FIRST AWARDS THAT CIRM MADE BACK IN 2005
20	WERE TRAINING GRANT AWARDS, ONE OF WHICH LED TO THE
21	TRAINING OF DR. ROSSI, WHICH J.T. REFERRED TO
22	EARLIER, CO-FOUNDER OF MODERNA. PROP 14
23	REESTABLISHES THIS PROGRAM WHICH WAS TERMINATED IN
24	APPROXIMATELY 2012 AFTER THOSE GRANT TERMS RAN THEIR
25	COURSE.

1	THERE ARE TWO ELEMENTS OF THE TRAINING AND
2	FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS. AND THE TERMINOLOGY IS A
3	LITTLE BIT CONFUSING BECAUSE PROP 14 REFERS TO
4	TRAINING AWARDS WHICH REALLY ARE THE CIRM BRIDGES
5	PROGRAM. SO THESE ARE AWARDS TO TRAIN
6	UNDERGRADUATES IN TECHNICAL CAREERS IN STEM CELL
7	RESEARCH AND OTHER VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES
8	IDENTIFIED BY THE BOARD AND TO PROVIDE FELLOWSHIPS
9	TO MASTER'S STUDENTS FOR ADVANCED DEGREES. PROP 14
10	DOES MAKE CLEAR THAT THERE IS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR
11	COLLABORATION WITH INDUSTRY THROUGH SPONSORED
12	INTERNSHIPS.
13	WHAT CIRM REFERRED TO IN 2005 AS ITS
14	TRAINING AWARDS UNDER PROP 14 ARE REFERRED TO AS
15	FELLOWSHIP AWARDS. AND THIS IS A PROGRAM DESIGNED
16	TO PROVIDE FUNDING TO ACADEMIC AND NONPROFIT
17	RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS TO SUPPORT GRADUATE, POST-DOC,
18	AND MEDICAL STUDENTS IN STEM CELL RESEARCH AND OTHER
19	VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES. AND IT SPECIFICALLY
20	REFERENCED THE POSSIBILITY OF COLLABORATION THROUGH
21	THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS OR COMMUNITY CARE
22	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AS PART OF THE FELLOWSHIP.
23	J.T., I'LL PAUSE THERE AND TURN IT BACK TO
24	YOU.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO THANK YOU, JAMES. SO
	26

1	WE ARE GOING TO DIVERT SLIGHTLY FROM OUR SEQUENCE
2	HERE ON THIS PARTICULAR ITEM. AS DR. MILLAN AND DR.
3	SHEPARD HAVE COMMENTS, SORT OF GIVING MORE
4	BACKGROUND ON THESE PROGRAMS WHEN WE GET TO THEIR
5	PRESENTATION. AND I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THOSE
6	COMMENTS MADE BEFORE THE BOARD DISCUSSES THIS
7	PARTICULAR ITEM AS I THINK THAT WILL BETTER INFORM
8	THE CONVERSATION. SO, JAMES, IF YOU COULD MOVE ON
9	TO THE NEXT ITEM PLEASE.
LO	MR. HARRISON: YES. THE OTHER NEW PROGRAM
L1	UNDER PROP 14, AGAIN, WILL BE FAMILIAR TO SOME OF
L2	YOU SINCE IT BUILDS UPON ONE OF CIRM'S INITIAL
L3	PROGRAMS. THIS IS THE SHARED LABS PROGRAM WHICH IS
L4	DESIGNED TO PROVIDE FUNDING TO ACADEMIC AND
L5	NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS FOR SPECIALIZED LABS
L6	TO CONDUCT STEM CELL RESEARCH, INCLUDING
L7	INSTRUMENTATION, CELL LINES, CULTURE MATERIALS, AS
L8	WELL AS TRAINING AND INSTRUCTION IN RESEARCH METHODS
L9	AND TECHNOLOGIES.
20	ONE SPECIFIC ASPECT OF THE PROGRAM
21	DESIGNED TO PROMOTE COLLABORATION AND ACCESS IS A
22	REQUIREMENT THAT THE SHARED LAB AWARDEES PROVIDE AN
23	ACCESS PLAN FOR RESEARCHERS AT NEIGHBORING
24	INSTITUTIONS BOTH FOR PURPOSES OF ACCESSING THE
25	TRAINING CLASSES AS WELL AS FOR THE CONDUCT OF

1	RESEARCH. IMPORTANTLY, AS I'LL DISCUSS A LITTLE BIT
2	LATER, PROP 14 DOES ALLOCATE SOME FACILITIES FUNDING
3	TO BUILD, EQUIP, AND OPERATE THE COMMUNITY CARE
4	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, AS WELL AS TO BUILD AND EQUIP
5	SHARED LABS.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO THIS GOES BACK TO THE
7	EARLY DAYS AGAIN. AND I WONDERED, WITHOUT PUTTING
8	YOU GUYS ON THE SPOT, DR. STEWARD OR DR. PRIETO, IF
9	YOU HAVE THOUGHTS ON THE SHARED LABS AS IT WAS IN
10	ITS FIRST ITERATION AND GOING FORWARD AS WELL SINCE
11	YOU GUYS ARE THE SEASONED VETERANS WHO LIVED THIS IN
12	REAL TIME BACK IN THE EARLY DAYS.
13	DR. PRIETO: OS, DO YOU WANT TO GO FIRST?
14	DR. STEWARD: SURE, I CAN. YEAH. I THINK
15	THAT THE SHARED LABS CERTAINLY PLAYED AN IMPORTANT
16	FUNCTION AT THE TIME IN I THINK WHAT I WOULD CALL
17	THE LAUNCH OF THE REALLY NEW TECHNOLOGIES THAT
18	EVERYBODY WAS TRYING TO DEPLOY. AND GOING FORWARD,
19	I THINK THAT THOSE SHARED LABS COULD PLAY THAT ROLE
20	AGAIN IN ADDITION, OF COURSE, TO THE ROLES THAT
21	WE'VE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT IN TERMS OF THE TRAINING
22	AND ENGAGEMENT OF PEOPLE IN THESE NEW TECHNOLOGIES.
23	AND I THINK REALLY IMPORTANTLY BEGINNING TO THINK IN
24	LET'S CALL IT CIRM-Y TERMS I LOVE IT MEANING
25	THAT THERE'S A GOAL OUT THERE. THERE'S AN URGENCY.

1	AND CIRM DOES SCIENCE IN A DIFFERENT WAY THAN OTHER
2	ORGANIZATIONS IN TERMS OF THAT FOCUS ON THE PRIZE,
3	SO TO SPEAK, GETTING IT DONE FOR THE PATIENTS.
4	SO I THINK THAT THAT WAS ONE OF THE
5	REASONS THAT THE SHARED LABS WAS A SUCCESS. GETTING
6	INTO THAT ENVIRONMENT AND EXPERIENCE THINGS PERHAPS
7	IN A DIFFERENT WAY THAN PEOPLE HAVE BEFORE. THANK
8	YOU.
9	DR. MELMED: J.T., I WANT TO JUST PICK UP
10	ON WHAT OS JUST SAID ABOUT TRAINING. WE DID
11	CONSIDER IN PREVIOUS ITERATIONS OF OUR LONG-TERM
12	PLANNING FORMALIZING TRAINING IN TERMS OF TRAINING
13	PROGRAMS AND HAVING FORMAL FELLOWSHIPS AND
14	POST-DOCS. IS THIS GOING TO BE PART OF THIS
15	INITIATIVE, OR ARE WE GOING TO HAVE A SEPARATE
16	TRAINING INITIATIVE? TRAINING FORMALIZATION BOTH
17	FOR POST-DOCS AND FOR CLINICAL FELLOWS, I THINK,
18	SHOULD BE FORMALIZED. AND WE WOULD BE IN A VERY
19	UNIQUE SITUATION OF CREATING THE FIRST SUCH
20	ACCREDITED PROGRAMS PROBABLY IN THE WORLD BASED ON
21	STEM CELL MEDICINE.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. MELMED, WE'RE GOING
23	TO TABLE THAT QUESTION TILL WE GET TO THE PART OF
24	DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION DEALING WITH THE TRAINING
25	PROGRAMS, AND WE WILL DISCUSS THAT IN DETAIL IF

1	THAT'S OKAY.
2	SO DR. PRIETO ON SHARED LABS.
3	DR. PRIETO: WELL, NOT JUST ON SHARED
4	LABS. I THOUGHT OS MIGHT BE ABLE TO SPEAK MORE
5	BRILLIANTLY THAN I ON THAT TOPIC, BUT IT WAS AN
6	IMPORTANT PART OF OUR EARLY STEPS. AND I REALLY
7	WANTED TO TALK MORE ABOUT THE TRAINING PROGRAMS.
8	EARLY ON WE HAD A PRETTY ROBUST CONVERSATION WITH
9	FOLKS FROM THE CSU AND THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY
10	COLLEGE SYSTEMS ABOUT THESE TRAINING PROGRAMS, ABOUT
11	PIPELINE ISSUES. AND REALLY THIS TOUCHES ON A LOT
12	OF THINGS EVEN ON HEALTH EQUITY THAT WE WERE TALKING
13	ABOUT A FEW MINUTES AGO BECAUSE IF YOU WANT TO BRING
14	ALL OF CALIFORNIA INTO THE MAINSTREAM, YOU HAVE TO
15	INVOLVE ALL THE COMMUNITIES OF CALIFORNIA IN THIS.
16	I THINK THAT THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF
17	EXCELLENCE ARE PART OF THAT CONVERSATION. WE SHOULD
18	BE TALKING WITH PEOPLE FROM COVERED CALIFORNIA ABOUT
19	HOW DOES THIS INTERACT WITH THE REST OF OUR
20	HEALTHCARE SYSTEM. I'M GLAD TO SEE THIS HAPPENING.
21	IT IS A LITTLE BIT FULL CIRCLE, AND I THINK IT'S A
22	GOOD THING.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. PRIETO.
24	I NOTE THAT DR. DEBENEDETTI WHO WAS
25	APPOINTED TO THE AAWG IS THE COVERED CALIFORNIA

1	PERSON ON THAT ENTITY. SO WE'LL CERTAINLY GET THAT
2	PERSPECTIVE AMONGST MANY OTHERS.
3	OTHER COMMENTS ON THE SHARED LAB ITEM BY
4	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
5	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST TO TALK
6	ABOUT SHARED. FRANCISCO LIT THE FIRE UNDER ME,
7	THINKING THAT I LOVE THE IDEA OF ADDRESSING
8	PIPELINE. AND I THINK THAT IF THERE'S ANOTHER
9	PARTNER YOU MIGHT BRING INTO THIS, IT MIGHT BE A
10	GREAT PLACE TO PUT THESE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS, AND
11	THAT IS THE CALIFORNIA PRIMARY CARE ASSOCIATION
12	WHICH REPRESENTS 1300 CLINICS IN CALIFORNIA THAT
13	SERVE THE MOST VULNERABLE OF OUR POPULATIONS, ONE IN
14	SEVEN CALIFORNIANS. THEY COULD BE EXCELLENT
15	PARTNERS AROUND THIS ISSUE.
16	SOME OF THEM EVEN HAVE THEIR OWN IRB'S AND
17	ATTEMPT TO DO RESEARCH. SO THERE IS SOME REAL
18	POSSIBILITIES BECAUSE YOU'LL PROBABLY FIND THEM IN
19	COMMUNITIES WHERE THERE ARE NOT GREAT RESEARCH
20	CENTERS. AND THEY MIGHT BE THE GREAT LINKS THAT
21	YOU'RE LOOKING FOR FOR MULTIPLE REASONS.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: VERY GOOD SUGGESTION.
23	THANK YOU.
24	DR. YAMAMOTO: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO LEARN
25	A LITTLE BIT ABOUT HOW THIS PROGRAM WAS UTILIZED AND
	4.1

1	HOW IT WAS SUCCESSFUL IN QUANTITATIVE WAYS. HOW
2	MANY LABORATORIANS WERE ACCESSED IN THIS WAY? HOW
3	MANY SHARED LAB GRANTS WERE GIVEN? AND HOW WERE
4	THEY UTILIZED? WHAT KINDS OF TRAINEES CAME INTO
5	THOSE ENVIRONMENTS AND SO FORTH?
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO, DR. MILLAN, DO YOU
7	HAVE ANY IDEA ON THAT?
8	DR. MILLAN: THAT WILL BE PART OF OUR
9	PRESENTATION, SO AFTER THIS DISCUSSION, WHICH IS
10	EXTREMELY USEFUL. THANK YOU SO MUCH. THIS IS A
11	GREAT DISCUSSION. WE'LL BE PROVIDING SOME MORE KIND
12	OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR PROGRAMS THAT HAVE
13	BEEN IDENTIFIED WHERE THERE WERE SOME LEGACY FORMATS
14	OF THESE PROGRAMS, AND THAT WILL BE ALSO VERY
15	INFORMATIVE. SO THE SHARED LABS KIND OF OUTPUT WILL
16	BE PART OF THAT PRESENTATION.
17	DR. YAMAMOTO: GREAT. THANKS, MARIA.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
19	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
20	DR. DEAS: YES. I REALLY LIKE THE
21	REQUIREMENT OF THE SHARED LABS PROVIDING THE ACCESS
22	TO RESEARCHERS FROM NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS. AND
23	THOSE INSTITUTIONS THAT COME TO MIND INCLUDE THE
24	COMMUNITY COLLEGES. THEREFORE, I WOULD ALSO BE
25	CAREFUL NOT TO TIE IN THE TRAINING PROGRAM AT THE

1	POST-DOC LEVEL WITH THE SHARED LABS. WE CAN DO
2	BOTH, HAVE POST-DOCS IN THE SHARED LABS, BUT IT
3	DOESN'T PRECLUDE PEOPLE, TRAINEES, THAT ARE NOT
4	POST-DOC BECAUSE IF WE DID THAT, THEN WE HAMPER THE
5	PIPELINE. AND I'D LIKE TO SEE FROM THOSE COMMUNITY
6	COLLEGES STUDENTS AT VARIOUS LEVELS BEING ABLE TO
7	BENEFIT FROM THE EXPERIENCE IN THESE SHARED LABS AS
8	WELL AS FACULTY AT THOSE INSTITUTIONS.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. DEAS.
10	AND, AGAIN, THAT POINT WE'LL REVISIT WHEN WE GET TO
11	THE PRESENTATION ON TRAINING, DR. MILLAN, A LITTLE
12	BIT LATER.
13	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
14	THANK YOU. JAMES, NEXT ITEM.
15	MR. HARRISON: SO WE'VE DISCUSSED THE
16	THREE LEGACY PROGRAMS UPON WHICH PROP 14 BUILT THE
17	ALPHA STEM CELL CLINIC, COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF
18	EXCELLENCE, THE TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, AND
19	THE SHARED LABS. THE ONE UNIQUELY NEW ELEMENT OF
20	PROP 14 IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TREATMENT AND
21	CURES ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.
22	THIS IS A NEW DIRECTION FOR CIRM TO BE RESPONSIBLE
23	FOR ESTABLISHING THIS GROUP TO CONSIDER ISSUES OF
24	ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY, TO RECOMMEND POLICIES AND
25	PROGRAMS WITH AN EYE TOWARDS ENHANCING ACCESS TO

1	CIRM-FUNDED CLINICAL TRIALS AND TREATMENTS AND CURES
2	THAT ARISE FROM CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH, AS WELL AS TO
3	CONSIDER ISSUES OF AFFORDABILITY.
4	AS THE CHAIR MENTIONED EARLIER, THE NEW
5	WORKING GROUP IS COMPOSED OF 17 MEMBERS, FIVE
6	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF
7	THE BOARD, AS WELL AS TEN OUTSIDE EXPERTS IN AREAS
8	LIKE COVERAGE, REIMBURSEMENT, HEALTHCARE DELIVERY,
9	PATIENT ACCESS, AND HEALTHCARE ECONOMICS. SO THE
10	WORKING GROUP WILL HAVE THE BENEFIT OF BROAD
11	EXPERTISE ON THESE ISSUES AS IT CONSIDERS
12	RECOMMENDING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO THE BOARD IN
13	AN EFFORT TO ENHANCE THE ACCESSIBILITY AND
14	AFFORDABILITY OF CIRM-FUNDED TREATMENTS AND CURES.
15	IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT IN ADDITION
16	TO ESTABLISHING THE WORKING GROUP, PROP 14 ALLOCATES
17	FUNDING FOR RESEARCH CONSULTING AWARDS IN THE AREA
18	OF ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY. AND IT ALSO
19	PROVIDES FOR THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING
20	BY THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP
21	SIMILAR TO THE FUNCTION THAT THE GRANTS WORKING
22	GROUP PLAYS WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH AWARDS. AND IT
23	PROVIDES FOR THE BOARD TO MAKE ALL FINAL DECISIONS
24	WITH RESPECT TO THOSE RESEARCH CONSULTING AWARDS.
25	J.T., I'LL TURN IT BACK TO YOU.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, COULD YOU ALSO
2	COMMENT ON IT PROVIDES FOR HIRING OF ADDITIONAL
3	MEMBERS OF THE CIRM TEAM? COULD YOU ADDRESS THAT AS
4	WELL?
5	MR. HARRISON: YES, THAT'S CORRECT. IT
6	ALLOCATES FUNDING FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OF THE
7	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP AND
8	PROVIDES FOR THE HIRING OF UP TO 15 EMPLOYEES TO
9	SUPPORT THAT EFFORT.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. SO THIS
11	WORKING GROUP IS A WORK IN PROGRESS. WE GET A LOT
12	OF QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS BECAUSE THIS IS AN
13	ABSOLUTELY CRUCIAL NEW PART OF WHAT WE'RE GOING TO
14	BE DOING GOING FORWARD AS WE HEAD INTO THE ERA OF
15	INCREASING CLINICAL TRIALS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF
16	TREATMENTS AND CURES.
17	I'VE ASKED SENATOR TORRES TO CHAIR THIS
18	WORKING GROUP, AND WE HAVE BEEN, AS I MENTIONED
19	EARLIER, IN THE PROCESS OF IDENTIFYING THE BOARD
20	MEMBERS WHICH WE NAMED AS WELL AS THE ADDITIONAL TEN
21	MEMBERS AND WILL HAVE A NUMBER OF NEW MEMBERS TO
22	PRESENT TO YOU FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT
23	MEETING.
24	THE WORKING GROUP IS GOING TO, ONCE IT
25	CONVENES, HAVE TO DEAL WITH ITS OWN SORT OF
	<u></u>

1	STRATEGIC PLANNING AND OPERATIONAL PLANNING, ET
2	CETERA. AND HIRING OF THE UP TO 15 NEW MEMBERS OF
3	THE CIRM TEAM TO SUPPORT IT, ALL OF THAT IS DOWN THE
4	ROAD AT THIS POINT AND WILL TAKE A LITTLE WHILE TO
5	PUT TOGETHER AND IMPLEMENT. BUT I JUST WANTED TO
6	GIVE YOU THAT ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND. AND I OPEN UP
7	THE TOPIC TO COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.
8	LET'S NOT BE SHY. SENATOR TORRES, MAYBE YOU'D LIKE
9	TO MAKE SOME COMMENTS ABOUT THIS.
10	MR. TORRES: WELL, I THINK IT'S PRETTY
11	SELF-EVIDENT, SO WE'LL JUST CONTINUE TO REPORT BACK
12	TO THE BOARD AS WE MAKE MORE APPOINTMENTS, AND THEN
13	MOVE FORWARD WITH OUR STRATEGIC PLAN THAT MARIA AND
14	I WILL BE WORKING ON TOGETHER AS WELL AS YOU.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. OTHER COMMENTS BY
16	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY. HEARING NONE, LET'S
17	MOVE ON TO THE NEXT TOPIC.
18	MR. HARRISON: ONE OF THE SIGNIFICANT
19	CHANGES PROP 14 MAKES IS TO AFFORD CIRM ADDITIONAL
20	FLEXIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO THE CATEGORIES OF
21	RESEARCH THE AGENCY FUNDS. UNDER EXISTING LAW, OR I
22	SHOULD SAY PREEXISTING LAW, CIRM WAS LIMITED TO
23	FUNDING STEM CELL RESEARCH AND WHAT WERE TERMED
24	OTHER VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES. OTHER VITAL
25	RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES WERE CONSIDERED STEM

1	CELL-RELATED OPPORTUNITIES THAT CAME WITH THE
2	RECOMMENDATION OF TWO-THIRDS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
3	WORKING GROUPS.
4	PROP 14 CHANGES THIS IN SEVERAL WAYS.
5	FIRST, IT INCLUDES GENETIC RESEARCH WITHIN THE SCOPE
6	OF CIRM FUNDING. SO IT DEFINES STEM CELL DISCOVERY
7	RESEARCH TO INCLUDE GENETIC RESEARCH, MAKING IT
8	AUTOMATICALLY WITHIN SCOPE FOR CIRM AWARDS.
9	ANOTHER INTERESTING CHANGE MADE BY PROP 14
10	IS TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF AWARDS ACROSS THE RESEARCH
11	SPECTRUM. SO PREVIOUSLY PROP 71 PROVIDED THAT CIRM
12	COULD MAKE AWARDS FOR RESEARCH, THERAPY DEVELOPMENT,
13	AND CLINICAL TRIALS. PROP 14 EXPANDS THAT TO
14	INCLUDE AWARDS FOR THERAPY DELIVERY, BUT DOES NOT
15	OFFER ADDITIONAL DEFINITION OR GUIDANCE WITH RESPECT
16	TO WHAT THAT MIGHT ENTAIL, AFFORDING CIRM
17	SIGNIFICANT DISCRETION TO DEFINE ITS MISSION IN THAT
18	AREA.
19	IMPORTANTLY, PROP 14 AUTHORIZES THE BOARD
20	BY MAJORITY VOTE TO DESIGNATE A RESEARCH CATEGORY AS
21	A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, MEANING THAT THE BOARD
22	HAS THE POWER TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF CIRM-FUNDED
23	RESEARCH BEYOND STEM CELL AND GENETIC RESEARCH.
24	PROP 14 OFFERS TWO EXAMPLES OF VITAL RESEARCH
25	OPPORTUNITIES, PERSONALIZED MEDICINE AND AGING AS A
	47

PATHOLOGY. ONCE THE BOARD HAS DESIGNATED CATEGORIES
OF VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, IT IS WITHIN SCOPE
FOR PURPOSES OF FUNDING, MEANING THAT IT DOES NOT
NEED THE RECOMMENDATION OF TWO-THIRDS OF THE MEMBERS
OF THE WORKING GROUP IN ORDER FOR THE AGENCY TO FUND
IT.
AND, J.T., I'LL PAUSE THERE AND TURN IT
BACK TO YOU.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANY COMMENTS ON
THIS PARTICULAR PAGE? OBVIOUSLY EACH OF THESE
THINGS REFERENCES BROAD CATEGORIES THAT WE WILL BE
CONSIDERING GOING FORWARD. SO THERE WILL BE LOTS OF
DISCUSSION AS WE GET INTO SPECIFICS, BUT ANY SORT OF
GENERAL COMMENTS ON THIS PAGE?
DR. GASSON: I HAVE A QUESTION IN TERMS OF
GENETIC RESEARCH.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GOT A LOT OF STATIC
THERE.
DR. GASSON: IS THAT BETTER?
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: NOT REALLY.
DR. GASSON: TRYING AGAIN.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, PERFECT.
DR. GASSON: OH, GOOD. I JUST HAD A
QUESTION ABOUT GENETIC RESEARCH AND WHETHER THAT IS
REFERRING SPECIFICALLY TO GENE THERAPY, OR IF IT'S
48

1	REFERRING BROADLY TO BASIC SCIENCE
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE STARTED TO HEAR YOU,
3	THEN YOU SORT OF FADED OUT. IF YOU COULD JUST
4	PLEASE REPEAT THAT QUESTION.
5	DR. GASSON: CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW?
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
7	DR. GASSON: I HAD A QUESTION ON WHAT IS
8	COVERED BY GENETIC RESEARCH AND WHETHER IT'S
9	SPECIFICALLY REFERRING TO GENE THERAPY, OR IF IT
10	ALSO MORE BROADLY WOULD INCLUDE FUNDAMENTAL WORK
11	LOOKING AT GENETIC ALTERATIONS.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, I DON'T KNOW IF
13	YOU COULD HEAR THAT.
14	MR. HARRISON: I COULD. DR. GASSON ASKED
15	WHETHER GENETIC RESEARCH WAS SPECIFICALLY LIMITED TO
16	GENE THERAPY OR WAS BROADER THAN THAT. AND THE
17	ANSWER IS THAT IT IS NOT DEFINED. AT LEAST IT'S NOT
18	DEFINED BY PROP 14. IT'S WITHIN CIRM'S DISCRETION
19	TO DETERMINE HOW BROADLY TO CONSTRUE THE SCOPE OF
20	THAT FUNDING OPPORTUNITY.
21	DR. GASSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER QUESTIONS BY
23	MEMBERS OR COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
24	DR. PRIETO: I HAVE SOME CONCERNS. I
25	DON'T WANT TO WEIGH IN TOO MUCH HERE AS KIND OF A

1	SHORT-TIMER, BUT I DO HAVE SOME CONCERNS ABOUT, NOT
2	NECESSARILY MISSION CREEP, BUT DEFINING FOR
3	PARTICULARLY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WHERE
4	DISCUSSIONS AROUND THESE ISSUES ARE OFTEN HELD WHAT
5	WE REALLY CONSIDER TO BE VITAL RESEARCH
6	OPPORTUNITIES. REMEMBERING THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF
7	PROP 14 AS WELL AS THE NEW PROPOSITION, LOOKING FOR
8	OPPORTUNITIES TO DO THINGS THAT AREN'T BEING DONE
9	ELSEWHERE. I THINK THIS IS ONE OF THE REASONS WE'VE
10	HAD GREAT SUCCESS IS WE REALLY PIONEERED SOMETHING
11	THAT WAS NOT BEING DONE IN ANY MAJOR WAY IN OTHER
12	INSTITUTIONS UNTIL CALIFORNIA GOT THE BALL ROLLING.
13	WE DON'T WANT TO BE DUPLICATING WHAT OTHER
14	PEOPLE ARE DOING. I DON'T THINK THERE'S TOO MUCH
15	DANGER OF THAT, BUT WE NEED TO PROVIDE SOME GUIDANCE
16	FOR THE GWG WHEN THE RUBBER MEETS THE ROAD AND
17	THEY'RE EVALUATING GRANT APPLICATIONS.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. I THINK THAT'S
19	RIGHT. I DO THINK BY THE LANGUAGE OF THE
20	PROPOSITION, DR. PRIETO, THAT IT AIMS TO, AT THE
21	BOARD'S DISCRETION, INCREASE THE SCOPE OF WHAT MIGHT
22	QUALIFY AS A VRO. SO I THINK THAT AS WE GO ALONG,
23	THE BOARD WILL WANT TO HAVE A REAL DISCUSSION ON
24	THAT TOPIC. AND OBVIOUSLY THIS ISN'T MEANT TO OPEN
25	UP THE UNIVERSE TO A WIDE RANGE OF THINGS THAT HAVE

1	NO RELEVANCE TO THE FIELD, BUT IT WILL LIKELY ENTAIL
2	THE SLIGHTLY ENLARGED VERSION OF WHAT'S ACCEPTABLE,
3	BUT DEFINITELY DO NEED TO HAVE THAT DISCUSSION AND
4	ABSOLUTELY DO NEED TO PROVIDE GUIDANCE TO THE GWG.
5	THANK YOU.
6	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
7	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO FRANCISCO'S
8	POINT, IN MY MIND, OF COURSE, I WORK AROUND GENETIC
9	RESEARCH AS WELL, BUT WHERE I SEE IS THE DIFFERENCE
10	THAT CIRM CAN MAKE IS SOMETHING THAT WE HAVE NOW
11	ATTEMPTED TO INCLUDE IN OUR RESEARCH APPLICATIONS,
12	AND THAT IS A REAL FOCUSED, CONCENTRATED EFFORT TO
13	MAKE SURE THAT ALL RESEARCH IS INCLUSIVE OF
14	COMMUNITIES OF COLOR AND VULNERABLE POPULATIONS WHO
15	HAVE NOT BENEFITED FROM RESEARCH MUCH LESS ADVANCED
16	RESEARCH. AND I THINK THAT IF WE SHOW EXAMPLES AND
17	MODELS OF WHAT THAT REALLY LOOKS LIKE IN PRACTICE,
18	BECAUSE WE ARE KEEPING RESEARCHERS' FEET TO THE FIRE
19	ON THESE ISSUES, THAT TO ME IS THE NEW MODEL. THERE
20	JUST HASN'T BEEN ENOUGH FOCUS ON THIS. THERE HASN'T
21	BEEN ANY CONSEQUENCE FOR IGNORING THAT KIND OF
22	REQUIREMENT IN OUR APPLICATIONS. AND TO ME, IN MY
23	MIND, I DON'T CARE WHICH AREA OF RESEARCH, IT IS
24	THAT WE REQUIRE RESEARCHERS TO RESPECT AND TO DO
25	SOMETHING ABOUT UNDER-RESEARCHED POPULATIONS SO THAT

1	THEY CAN BE BROUGHT INTO THE NORM OF CARE AND
2	TREATMENT AND ADVANCED CARE. THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO
3	SAY.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
5	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6	DR. BRASHEAR: YSABEL'S POINT. IS THAT
7	HARD CODED INTO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
8	APPLICATIONS? AND SO SAYING HOW YOU ARE GOING TO
9	EXTEND IT TO A BROADER COMMUNITY BE INCLUSIVE OF ALL
10	COMMUNITIES, IS THAT HARD CODED IN THE APPLICATION?
11	IS IT MANDATED TO HAVE A PART IN THAT?
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO WE'VE HAD A LOT OF
13	DISCUSSION ON THIS. DR. MILLAN, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
14	SPEAK TO THAT POINT?
15	DR. MILLAN: ABSOLUTELY. DR. BRASHEAR,
16	CURRENTLY THERE IS A SECTION OF ALL APPLICATIONS FOR
17	PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS THAT ARE OPEN WHERE THE
18	RESEARCHERS ARE REQUIRED TO OUTLINE THEIR PLAN THAT
19	ADDRESS DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION THAT ARE
20	APPROPRIATE FOR THE TYPE OF PROGRAM THEY'RE DOING,
21	WHETHER IT'S IN THE BASIC SCIENCE, TRANSLATIONAL
22	CLINICAL STAGE. AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT'S NOW
23	PART OF THE APPLICATION AND WILL BE BROUGHT IN FRONT
24	OF THE REVIEW PANEL, THE GWG, AS WELL AS THE BOARD,
25	AND THE BOARD WILL BE ABLE TO ALSO HAVE PROGRAMMATIC

1	DISCUSSIONS ON THOSE TOPICS.
2	DR. SANDMEYER: CAN SOMEONE COMMENT ON HOW
3	DYNAMIC THESE VRO'S ARE? SO ONCE ESTABLISHED, IS IT
4	SORT OF A STANDING VRO OR ARE THEY MORE ON A
5	CASE-BY-CASE BASIS? LIKE THOSE EXAMPLES, ARE THEY
6	STANDING VRO'S ALREADY, OR IS THAT A FOR INSTANCE?
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: TO DATE THE VRO HAS BEEN
8	VERY CASE BY CASE SPECIFIC, AND WE'VE HAD NOT THAT
9	MANY INSTANCES WHERE THEY'VE BEEN ACTUALLY
10	CONSIDERED BY THE GWG, BUT THEY'VE BEEN VERY DEFINED
11	WITH RESPECT TO SCOPE AND THE PARTICULARS OF THE
12	APPLICATION QUESTION. I THINK THAT THIS IS
13	SOMETHING THAT WE WILL HAVE ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ON
14	AS TO HOW BROAD GOING FORWARD THE CATEGORIES MAY BE.
15	JAMES, AGAIN, WHAT WAS THE THOUGHT OF THE
16	FRAMERS ON THAT PARTICULAR QUESTION?
17	MR. HARRISON: TO BE CLEAR, THERE'S
18	NOTHING AUTOMATIC ABOUT THE VITAL RESEARCH
19	OPPORTUNITIES. IT WOULD REQUIRE BOARD ACTION TO
20	DESIGNATE A CATEGORY OF RESEARCH. EVEN THE EXAMPLES
21	THAT WERE OFFERED IN PROP 14, PERSONALIZED MEDICINE
22	AND AGING AS A PATHOLOGY, AS VITAL RESEARCH
23	OPPORTUNITIES BEFORE THOSE CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH
24	COULD BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING. SO THAT WOULD
25	HAVE TO BE AN EXPRESS DECISION MADE BY THE BOARD
	F-2

1	BEFORE ADDITIONAL RESEARCH CATEGORIES COULD BE THE
2	SUBJECT OF CIRM AWARDS.
3	DR. SANDMEYER: SO PEOPLE WOULDN'T APPLY
4	SORT OF WITHOUT BEING ABLE TO ASSERT THEMSELVES AS A
5	VRO.
6	MR. HARRISON: CORRECT. I THINK THE
7	NOTION IS THAT THE BOARD WOULD FIRST ACT TO
8	DESIGNATE SOME NEW OPPORTUNITY, AS DR. PRIETO
9	MENTIONED, WHICH IS BEING CURRENTLY UNDERSERVED. AS
10	A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, THE CIRM TEAM WOULD
11	DEVELOP A CONCEPT PLAN AND A PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT
12	WHICH WOULD DEFINE THE TERMS OF ELIGIBILITY.
13	SO THERE'S NOTHING AUTOMATIC AND CIRM WILL
14	NOT BE ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS FOR VITAL RESEARCH
15	OPPORTUNITIES PRIOR TO THE BOARD'S DECISION TO GRANT
16	THAT STATUS AND THE ISSUANCE OF A PROGRAM
17	ANNOUNCEMENT IN THAT AREA.
18	DR. MELMED: I THINK THAT'S A VERY
19	IMPORTANT QUESTION. I THINK SUZANNE RAISES A VERY,
20	VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION FOR THIS BOARD. PART OF THE
21	SIGNIFICANT SCIENTIFIC DIRECTION OR STRATEGY THAT WE
22	COULD OFFER IS, IN FACT, IN THIS EXAMPLE. AND I
23	THINK WE SHOULD REALLY DELINEATE A PROCESS BY WHICH
24	THE BOARD WILL BE ABLE TO PRIORITIZE VRO'S. WE ARE
25	GOING TO GET INUNDATED WITH ALL OF OUR INPUTS AS TO

1	FAVORITE TOPICS FOR VRO'S. I THINK IT'S VERY
2	IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE A RIGOROUS AND TRANSPARENT
3	PROCESS TO PRIORITIZE VRO'S. THIS WILL BECOME THE
4	MOST IMPORTANT STRATEGIC DRIVER, I THINK, FOR THE
5	FUTURE OF OUR SUPPORT.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU
7	ALL. OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
8	DR. YAMAMOTO: I AGREE WITH THESE POINTS
9	THAT HAVE BEEN MADE ABOUT VRO'S, BUT I WOULD ALSO
10	LIKE TO JUST GO BACK TO THE TOP OF THIS SLIDE TO
11	MAYBE CONSIDER GENETIC RESEARCH BROADENING OF THE
12	SCOPE OF CIRM FUNDING. WHAT'S STATED IS THAT STEM
13	CELL DISCOVERY RESEARCH WOULD INCLUDE GENETIC
14	RESEARCH. GENETIC RESEARCH, OF COURSE, IS EXTREMELY
15	BROAD. AND SO CONCERNS ABOUT MISSION CREEP, TO ME,
16	WOULD REALLY BEGIN TO EXTEND TO CONCERNS ABOUT A
17	DEPARTURE FROM MISSION OVERALL. AND THERE'S A LOT
18	OF RESEARCH THAT COULD BE CLASSIFIED AS GENETIC
19	RESEARCH. AND TO JUST INCLUDE THAT BIG BUNDLE AS
20	STEM CELL DISCOVERY RESEARCH WITHOUT FURTHER
21	DISCRIMINATION, I HAVE SOME CONCERNS THAT WE WOULD
22	AGAIN BE FLOODED WITH APPLICATIONS THAT REALLY HAVE
23	NOTHING TO DO WITH STEM CELL DISCOVERY, BUT ARE VERY
24	VALID GENETIC RESEARCH PROJECTS.
25	I'M NOT OPPOSED TO THE FACT THAT CIRM

1	WOULD BROADEN ITS SCOPE INTO INCLUDE EXCITING, NEW
2	GENETIC RESEARCH, BUT IT IS, I THINK, IMPORTANT FOR
3	US TO CONSIDER WHAT THE CHALLENGES THAT WOULD BE
4	INCUMBENT ON BROADENING IT TO THAT EXTENT WITHOUT
5	DISCRIMINATION. SO I GUESS MY QUESTION IS MAYBE WE
6	LEARN A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT WHAT THE INTENT WAS IN
7	THE FRAMING OF THIS ELEMENT AND WHETHER THE GRANTS
8	WORKING GROUPS WOULD HAVE SOME DISCRETION IN TERMS
9	OF BEING ABLE TO ASSESS WHETHER A GIVEN GENETIC
10	RESEARCH PROJECT REALLY WAS WITHIN SCOPE OF WHAT
11	CIRM'S PRIMARY MISSION IS.
12	DR. STEWARD: COULD I JUST ADD SOMETHING,
13	J.T THIS IS OS OR MAYBE MAKE A COMMENT HERE?
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, PLEASE.
15	DR. STEWARD: SO JUST MAYBE TO GO BACK AND
16	FRAME THIS BASED ON THE HISTORY OF CIRM. AND,
17	JAMES, PLEASE CORRECT ME OR ANYONE, MARIA. REALLY
18	THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES WERE USED PERHAPS
19	TWICE IN THE ENTIRE HISTORY OF CIRM AND CERTAINLY
20	WERE MEANT TO BE EXCEPTIONS THAT WERE BASED ON
21	REALLY EXTRAORDINARY NEW THINGS, NOT JUST, OH, YEAH,
22	THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE WE CAN DO. SO THAT WOULD BE
23	NO. 1.
24	NO. 2, THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES,
25	AS JAMES ALREADY EXPLAINED, WERE PREDETERMINED BY

1	THE BOARD. IN OTHER WORDS, THEY NEVER GOT TO THE
2	STAGE OF BEING REFERRED TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
3	UNLESS THE BOARD HAD ALREADY IDENTIFIED THAT AREA AS
4	BEING ONE OF VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. AGAIN,
5	VITAL AND OPPORTUNITY THERE, I THINK, ARE THE TWO
6	WORDS THAT THE BOARD USED HISTORICALLY TO CONSIDER
7	THE EXCEPTIONS THAT WERE GRANTED. AGAIN, I'M JUST
8	CURIOUS HOW MANY.
9	THE THIRD THING, I GUESS TO SAY, IS JUST
10	TO POINT OUT THAT ACTUALLY, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, AND
11	AGAIN, PLEASE CORRECT ME, JAMES, IF I'M WRONG, PROP
12	14 REALLY DOESN'T USE THE WORD "GENETIC RESEARCH" AS
13	MUCH AS IT DOES THE WORD "GENE THERAPY." MEANING
14	NOT JUST EVERYTHING RELATED TO IMPACT OF GENES ON
15	WHATEVER, BUT REALLY APPROACHES THAT INVOLVE THERAPY
16	MODIFICATION. SO THOSE ARE THREE COMMENTS. AND I'M
17	REALLY ASKING SORT OF FOR EXPANSION ON THOSE BY
18	JAMES FIRST IN TERMS OF THE PROP LANGUAGE AND MAYBE
19	MARIA AND OTHERS IN TERMS OF KIND OF THE WAY WE HAVE
20	THOUGHT ABOUT VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES IN THE
21	PAST. THANK YOU.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES, DO YOU WANT TO
23	START THERE?
24	MR. HARRISON: SURE. FIRST, WITH RESPECT
25	TO OS' LAST POINT, PROP 14 USES THE TERM "GENETIC

1	RESEARCH," BUT I THINK IN CONTEXT OS IS CORRECT
2	ABOUT WHAT WAS INTENDED. HOWEVER, THE TERM DOES
3	AFFORD THE BOARD SOME FLEXIBILITY TO DEFINE WHAT
4	THAT MEANS.
5	WITH RESPECT TO DR. YAMAMOTO'S QUESTION,
6	ELIGIBILITY IS DEFINED BY THE BOARD IN ITS APPROVAL
7	OF CONCEPT PLANS AND IS INCLUDED IN THE TERMS OF
8	EACH PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT. SO THE BOARD DID TAKE
9	ACTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE CONCEPT PLANS TO
10	INCLUDE GENE THERAPY AS DEFINED, AND SO LIMITED
11	ELIGIBILITY IN THAT WAY. SO THE GATE IS NOT OPEN TO
12	ANY NEW APPLICATION FOR GENETIC RESEARCH BEYOND WHAT
13	THE BOARD HAS AUTHORIZED THROUGH ITS APPROVAL OF THE
14	CONCEPT PLANS.
15	DR. MILLAN: JUST TO RESPOND TO THE
16	NUMBERS, THERE WERE TWO INSTANCES OF VRO'S. ONE WAS
17	FOR GENE THERAPY AND THE OTHER WAS IN THE CONTEXT OF
18	THE EMERGENCY COVID FUNDING OPPORTUNITY FOR
19	CONVALESCENT PLASMA RESEARCH.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK THE GENERAL
21	ANSWER TO EVERYBODY'S QUESTION IS THE BOARD WILL
22	HAVE CONSIDERABLE MORE DISCUSSION ON THIS AND REFINE
23	WHAT QUALIFIES IN THE VRO CATEGORY. AND, MOST
24	DEFINITELY, WE ARE NOT LOOKING TO OPEN UP FLOODGATES
25	IN A GENERAL FASHION TO THINGS THAT ARE SORT OF

1	BEYOND THE PURVIEW OF THE MISSION. SO APPRECIATE
2	EVERYBODY'S COMMENTS ON ALL OF THAT.
3	ANY OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE
4	BOARD? OKAY. JAMES, NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
5	MR. HARRISON: AS I MENTIONED AT THE
6	OUTSET, ONE OF THE NEW FEATURES OF PROP 14 THAT
7	DISTINGUISHES IT FROM PROP 71 IS THAT PROP 14
8	SPECIFICALLY EARMARKS \$1.5 BILLION OF THE 5.5
9	BILLION FOR THE PURPOSES OF SUPPORTING RESEARCH
10	INVOLVING DISEASES AND CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN AND
11	CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM. THE MEASURE DOES OFFER
12	EXAMPLES OF THE TYPES OF DISEASES AND CONDITIONS
13	THAT IT MEANS TO INCLUDE, AND THOSE ARE IDENTIFIED
14	ON THE SLIDE, SO I WON'T REPEAT THEM.
15	AS WITH THE OTHER AREAS OF RESEARCH, THE
16	LANGUAGE OF THE STATUTE MAKES CLEAR DISEASES AND
17	CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN AND CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM
18	ACROSS THE RESEARCH SPECTRUM FROM BASIC RESEARCH TO
19	THERAPY DEVELOPMENT AND THERAPY DELIVERY. THE
20	MEASURE ALSO MAKES CLEAR THAT THAT 1.5 BILLION IS
21	INCLUSIVE OF THE PRO RATA SHARE OF THE COSTS OF
22	OVERSIGHT AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION NEEDED TO
23	SUPPORT THE MAKING OF THOSE AWARDS. I BELIEVE THE
24	CHAIR
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES. I
	F.O.

1	WOULD NOTE ON THIS POINT THAT, DR. MILLAN, CORRECT
2	ME IF I'M WRONG, BUT THE 1.5 FROM A RATIO STANDPOINT
3	TO 5.5 IS NOT TERRIBLY DISSIMILAR FROM THE AMOUNT OF
4	GRANTS, THE PERCENTAGE OF GRANTS WE GAVE TO
5	NEURO-RELATED PROJECTS UNDER PROP 71. IS THAT
6	ROUGHLY ACCURATE?
7	DR. MILLAN: I THINK GENERALLY SPEAKING.
8	AND WE ACTUALLY IN THE UPCOMING PRESENTATIONS WILL
9	HAVE A REVIEW OF THE CNS PORTFOLIO. SO WE'LL HAVE A
10	CHANCE TO LOOK AT THE ACTUAL NUMBERS SHORTLY.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OKAY. ARE
12	THERE COMMENTS ON THIS PARTICULAR SLIDE BY MEMBERS
13	OF THE BOARD?
14	DR. BRASHEAR: AS A NEUROLOGIST, I AM
15	REALLY HEARTENED TO SEE THIS. SO MANY OF THESE
16	DISEASES ARE IN OUR UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES THAT
17	DON'T HAVE ACCESS. SO THIS IS SOMETHING THAT I
18	THINK THERE WILL BE LOTS OF EXCITEMENT ABOUT.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
20	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
21	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: I WAS JUST GOING TO
22	COMMENT. I DON'T KNOW IF EVERYONE IS AWARE OF THE
23	ALZHEIMER'S TASK FORCE IN CALIFORNIA AND THE WORK
24	THAT WE'VE PUT IN AND THE GOVERNMENT ALLOCATED A LOT
25	OF MONEY IN THE BUDGET TOWARDS DIFFERENT THINGS TO

1	AID IN THE PROGRESS OF ALZHEIMER'S IN OUR STATE.
2	AND PERHAPS, AS THAT GETS MORE SOLIDIFIED, THERE, OF
3	COURSE, PERHAPS MAY BE SOME CROSSOVER AND WORK THAT
4	CAN BE DONE TOGETHER. INSTEAD OF PARALLEL, IT CAN
5	BE DONE SIMULTANEOUSLY. SO I JUST WANTED TO BRING
6	THAT UP AS THINGS COME TOGETHER.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
8	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
9	DR. SANDMEYER: I WOULD JUST ADD THE
10	COMMENT THAT WE SHOULD KEEP IN MIND THAT SOME OF THE
11	TYPES OF EXPERIMENTS THAT ARE DONE IN THIS FIELD
12	REQUIRE LONGER TIME TO COME TO FRUITION. AND SO I'M
13	NOT SURE HOW THAT FACTORS IN, BUT JUST TO KEEP THAT
14	IN MIND.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. THANK YOU. AND AS
16	WE KNOW, A NUMBER OF THESE DISEASES HAVE TO DATE
17	BEEN AMONGST THE MOST CHALLENGING TO TACKLE. AND
18	THAT GETS TO, DR. SANDMEYER, YOUR POINT, BUT IT ALSO
19	GETS TO THE ACUTE NEED TO DEVELOP NEW THERAPIES AND
20	CURES, WHICH IS WHY THE BILLION FIVE WAS
21	SPECIFICALLY EARMARKED FOR THIS PARTICULAR CATEGORY
22	OF DISEASES AND CONDITIONS.
23	OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
24	HEARING NONE, JAMES, NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
25	MR. HARRISON: NOW I'LL MOVE INTO SOME

1	MORE MUNDANE TOPICS, INCLUDING ADMINISTRATION AND
2	GOVERNANCE. PROP 14 EXPANDS THE SIZE OF THE BOARD
3	FROM 29 MEMBERS TO 35 MEMBERS. SO YOU WILL BE
4	JOINED BY NEW COLLEAGUES, INCLUDING DR. DEAS, WHO IS
5	NOW THE UC RIVERSIDE APPOINTEE, AS WELL AS A NEW
6	APPOINTEE FROM UCSF FRESNO/CLOVIS CAMPUS, TWO NURSES
7	WITH CLINICAL TRIAL AND/OR STEM CELL OR GENETIC
8	DELIVERY EXPERIENCE, AND TWO PATIENT ADVOCATES FOR
9	MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS UNDERLYING IN PART THE NEW
10	FOCUS ON DISEASES AND CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN AND
11	CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM.
12	TWO OTHER CHANGES OF NOTE, ONE OF WHICH
13	WILL ONLY LAST FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. PROP 14
14	AUTHORIZED THE APPOINTING AUTHORITIES TO REPLACE
15	MEMBERS WHO HAVE SERVED AT LEAST ONE-HALF OF THEIR
16	TERM IF THEY DO SO BY MARCH 16TH. THE CHAIR AND THE
17	VICE CHAIR ARE EXCLUDED FROM THIS. AND THIS WAS
18	REALLY INTENDED JUST AS AN OPPORTUNITY PARTICULARLY
19	FOR APPOINTING AUTHORITIES WHO MIGHT BE NEW TO THEIR
20	POSITIONS IF THEY SO DESIRE TO APPOINT THEIR OWN
21	MEMBERS TO REPLACE A MEMBER WHO'S SERVED AT LEAST
22	HALF OF HIS OR HER TERM.
23	FINALLY, PROP 14 INCLUDES A NEW MECHANISM
24	FOR THE BOARD TO INITIATE AN ACTION TO HAVE A MEMBER
25	REMOVED. IT PROVIDES THAT THE BOARD BY A 60-PERCENT

1	VOTE RECOMMEND TO THE APPOINTING AUTHORITY THAT THE
2	APPOINTING AUTHORITY REMOVED A MEMBER FROM SERVICE.
3	J.T., BACK TO YOU.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ANY COMMENTS
5	ON THIS PAGE BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6	MR. TORRES: I JUST WANTED TO SAY, MR.
7	CHAIRMAN, THAT THE NEW APPOINTMENTS THAT JAMES
8	REFERENCED GO BACK TO WHAT WE HAD A DISCUSSION
9	EARLIER, AND THAT IS REGIONAL APPOINTMENTS THAT
10	REFLECT PARTS OF CALIFORNIA THAT WERE NOT PREVIOUSLY
11	REPRESENTED ON OUR BOARD. I'M SO PROUD THAT THE
12	DEAN AT RIVERSIDE, WHO IS WITH US, AND ALSO THAT WE
13	INCLUDE ANOTHER REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE INLAND
14	EMPIRE, AS WELL AS FROM THE FRESNO/CLOVIS AREA WHERE
15	WE HAVE, OTHER THAN OUR GREAT MEMBER, ADRIANA
16	PADILLA, THIS WILL INCREASE THAT REPRESENTATION FROM
17	RURAL CALIFORNIA FAR TOO OFTEN IGNORED BY OUR
18	POLICYMAKERS ON THE STATE LEGISLATIVE LEVEL AND
19	CLEARLY IN TERMS OF HEALTH ACCESSIBILITY. SO I WANT
20	TO SAY THAT'S A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT STEP THAT WE
21	ARE TAKING FORWARD TO REACH OUT TO UNDERSERVED
22	COMMUNITIES.
23	MR. ROWLETT: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS AL
24	ROWLETT. TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, I WANTED TO
25	ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN MAKING

1	RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CHAIR AND TO THE VICE CHAIR
2	REGARDING PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE
3	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH OR IN THIS CASE MENTAL HEALTH
4	COMMUNITY. AGAIN, IN KEEPING WITH EVERYTHING THAT
5	THE VICE CHAIR, SENATOR TORRES, SAID REGARDING
6	REFLECTING THE UNIQUE DIVERSITY AND THE WONDERFUL
7	ATTRIBUTES OF OUR STATE, AND SO WILL CONTINUE TO
8	MAKE THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS. AND CERTAINLY I WANT TO
9	ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I'VE BEEN SOLICITED TO DO SO BY
10	BOTH THE CHAIR AND THE VICE CHAIR.
11	MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, AL.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MR. ROWLETT.
13	YOU'VE BEEN, AS ALWAYS, EXTREMELY HELPFUL. VERY
14	MUCH APPRECIATE YOUR INPUT.
15	COMMENTS BY OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
16	MR. TORRES: JUST TO LET AL KNOW THAT I
17	SENT HIS RECOMMENDATION TO THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
18	AND TALKED ABOUT IT. SO SHE'S REVIEWING A NUMBER OF
19	OTHER APPLICATIONS THAT'S BEFORE HER, BUT CERTAINLY
20	THAT ONE HAS BEEN REFERRED TO HER, AL.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS? OKAY.
22	JAMES, NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
23	MR. HARRISON: PROP 14 ALSO MAKES SOME
24	CHANGES TO GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION. YOU WILL
25	BE SURPRISED TO LEARN IT INCREASES THE NUMBER OF

1	TIMES YOU'RE REQUIRED TO MEET EACH YEAR FROM TWO TO
2	FOUR. THOUGH GIVEN THE WORKLOAD, I DON'T THINK
3	MEETING THAT TARGET WILL BE A PROBLEM.
4	PROP 71 HAD IMPOSED A CAP OF 50 EMPLOYEES,
5	WHICH WAS SUBSEQUENTLY ELIMINATED BY THE
6	LEGISLATURE. PROP 14 REIMPOSES A CAP, AT THIS TIME
7	70 EMPLOYEES, AND THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE AN
8	ADDITIONAL UP TO 15 EMPLOYEES TO SUPPORT THE WORK OF
9	THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.
10	AND AS I MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY, IT
11	AUTHORIZES THE CHAIR AND THE PRESIDENT TO ESTABLISH
12	ADVISORY TASK FORCES, AND IT REQUIRES THE BOARD TO
13	DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY
14	POLICIES AND PROGRAMS BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS
15	MADE BY THE AAWG.
16	ONE OTHER SIGNIFICANT CHANGE, GIVEN THE
17	DEMANDS ON PATIENT ADVOCATES AS WELL AS THE NURSE
18	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD TO SERVE ON THE NOW FOUR
19	WORKING GROUPS OF CIRM, PROP 14 PROVIDES FOR PATIENT
20	ADVOCATES TO BE COMPENSATED BASED ON A DAILY
21	CONSULTING RATE ESTABLISHED BY THE BOARD RATHER THAN
22	THE STATE PER DIEM.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES.
24	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS PAGE?
25	OKAY. HEARING NONE, JAMES, NEXT PAGE PLEASE.

1	MR. HARRISON: I WILL CONTINUE WITH SOME
2	OF THE MORE DRY MATERIAL. PROP 14 DOES MAKE SOME
3	CHANGES TO REVIEW. CURRENTLY OR RATHER THAN UNDER
4	PREEXISTING LAW, MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUPS WERE
5	LIMITED TO TWO CONSECUTIVE TERMS. THE NEW LAW
6	AUTHORIZES THE BOARD, BY A TWO-THIRDS VOTE, TO
7	APPOINT A MEMBER TO SERVE BEYOND TWO CONSECUTIVE
8	TERMS.
9	CIRM HAS HAD A HISTORY OF USING AD HOC
10	MEMBERS TO PROVIDE PARTICULAR EXPERTISE IN CERTAIN
11	REVIEW. BUT UNDER PROP 71 THOSE MEMBERS WERE NOT
12	ALLOWED TO SCORE OR VOTE ON APPLICATIONS FOR
13	FUNDING. PROP 14 MODIFIES THAT TO ALLOW THE
14	APPOINTMENT OF AD HOC MEMBERS TO SERVE ON A WORKING
15	GROUP AND TO VOTE PROVIDED THAT THEIR NUMBER DOES
16	NOT EXCEED THREE OUT OF THE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS
17	FOR ANY ONE PEER REVIEW PANEL.
18	IMPORTANTLY, GIVEN THE POTENTIAL FOR
19	EXPANDED RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, PROP 14 EXPANDS THE
20	EXPERTISE OF MEMBERS OF THE GWG TO INCLUDE VITAL
21	RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE
22	BOARD WERE TO DETERMINE THAT A SPECIFIC OPPORTUNITY
23	CONSTITUTED A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, THEN CIRM
24	WOULD HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO APPOINT MEMBERS WHO HAVE
25	THAT EXPERTISE TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

1	UNDER PROP /1, MEMBERS OF THE WORKING
2	GROUP COULD JOIN TOGETHER IN A MINORITY REPORT, BUT
3	IT WAS NOT REQUIRED. PROP 14 MAKES MINORITY REPORTS
4	AUTOMATIC WHEN AT LEAST 35 PERCENT OF THE MEMBERS
5	SCORED AN APPLICATION IN FUNDING RANGE. AND THE
6	MINORITY REPORT IS REQUIRED TO SUMMARIZE THE
7	STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE APPLICATION IN ORDER
8	TO GIVE THE BOARD ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO GUIDE
9	ITS DECISION-MAKING. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, THE
10	NEW NURSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ARE ELIGIBLE TO BE
11	APPOINTED TO THE WORKING GROUPS IN ADDITION TO THE
12	PATIENT ADVOCATES. J.T.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES.
14	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS PAGE?
15	HEARING NONE, JAMES.
16	MS. DURON: SORRY, J.T. WITHOUT LOOKING
17	AT THE GUTS OF WHO SPECIFICALLY ARE BEING BROUGHT
18	ABOARD AND A HOPE TO EXPAND THE VOICES OF SOME OF
19	OUR LESS REPRESENTED COMMUNITY, ONE OF THE THINGS
20	THAT I WOULD ADVOCATE FOR WITH WHOEVER IS THE
21	LEADERSHIP ON THESE DIFFERENT COMMITTEES, ET CETERA,
22	ET CETERA, AS I'M STILL GETTING MY BRAIN AROUND ALL
23	OF THEM, IS THAT IF YOU REACH OUT TO COMMUNITY-BASED
24	ORGANIZATIONS AND BRING SOME OF THEIR LEADERSHIP
25	ABOARD BECAUSE THEY DO REFLECT THE VOICES OF THOSE

1	UNDERSERVED OFTENTIMES COMMUNITIES THAT AREN'T
2	OVERLY REPRESENTED. BUT I ALSO WOULD ENCOURAGE SOME
3	KINDS OF OPPORTUNITIES TO MAKE SURE THAT THESE
4	PARTICULAR MEMBERS SUCCEED AS PART OF THESE
5	COMMITTEES, AS PART OF THESE ADVISORY GROUPS.
6	ONE OF THE REASONS WHY I THINK WE DON'T
7	HAVE ENOUGH COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES WHO CAN GROW
8	THEIR CAPACITY TO BECOME PERHAPS A BOARD MEMBER AT
9	SOME POINT IN TIME IS BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT GIVEN
10	ENOUGH SUPPORT WHEN THEY JOIN AND THEN THEY AREN'T
11	SURE HOW THEY CAN USE THEIR VOICE, THEY'RE NOT SURE
12	WHAT TO SAY AND WHEN TO SAY. I THINK IT'S REALLY
13	IMPORTANT TO HELP BUILD THAT MUSCLE OUT THERE IN THE
14	COMMUNITY FOR JOINING ORGANIZATIONS LIKE THIS, FOR
15	JOINING COMMITTEES LIKE THIS. SO I'LL PUT THIS ON
16	ART'S TABLE, THAT WE REALLY CONSIDER, WHEN WE ARE
17	BRINGING THAT WE BRING COMMUNITY MEMBERS ABOARD
18	AND THAT WE DO EVERYTHING IN OUR POWER TO ASSURE
19	THAT THEY FEEL COMFORTABLE AT THE TABLE, THEY FEEL
20	THAT THEIR VOICES ARE HEARD, THAT THEY HAVE THE
21	SUPPORT OF THE LEADERSHIP SO THAT THEY STAY AND THEY
22	GROW AND FEEL THAT THEY CAN BE VERY PRODUCTIVE
23	REPRESENTATIVES OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.
24	MR. TORRES: HAVING BEEN A LATINO ALL OF
25	MY LIFE, I AM SURE I'LL BE SENSITIVE TO THAT.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. COMMENTS
2	FROM OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
3	MR. ROWLETT: THIS IS A MINOR POINT, BUT I
4	THINK IT ENDORSES WHAT MS. DURON HAS SAID REGARDING
5	BOARD ORIENTATION. AS THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
6	OF A COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION, YOU AND I HAVE
7	HAD A NUMBER OF CONVERSATIONS ABOUT MY ORIENTATION
8	EXPERIENCE. AND SO AS WE MAKE THAT PROCESS MORE
9	ROBUST, I THINK THAT WE DO A LOT TO ADVANCE, NOT
10	JUST FOR INDIVIDUALS LIKE MYSELF WHO HAVE THE UNIQUE
11	PRIVILEGE OF BEING IN LEADERSHIP IN COMMUNITY-BASED
12	ORGANIZATIONS AND REPRESENTING A COMMUNITY THAT IS
13	OFTEN UNSERVED AND UNDERSERVED, BUT ALSO EVEN FOR
14	THOSE WHO DO HAVE A LOT OF EXPERIENCE ON BOARDS LIKE
15	THIS, A MORE ROBUST BOARD ORIENTATION PROCESS IS
16	ALWAYS BENEFICIAL.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: POINT WELL TAKEN. THANK
18	YOU, MR. ROWLETT. OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE
19	BOARD? JAMES, NEXT PAGE PLEASE.
20	MR. HARRISON: IN RECOGNITION OF THE FACT
21	THAT ORGANIZATIONS CAN SOMETIMES ADOPT RULES AND
22	STANDARDS THAT BECOME STALE OVER TIME, PROP 14
23	REQUIRES THE BOARD EVERY FOUR YEARS TO REVIEW AND
24	UPDATE ITS STANDARDS RELATING TO CONFLICTS OF
25	INTEREST IN THE REVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR FUNDING,
	60

1	OTHER CONFLICT POLICIES, STANDARDS THAT THE BOARD
2	HAS ADOPTED FOR THE CONDUCT OF ETHICAL RESEARCH, AND
3	STANDARDS FOR INDEPENDENT AUDITS.
4	THE MEASURE DIRECTS THE BOARD TO, AT ITS
5	DISCRETION, CONSULT WITH THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF
6	SCIENCES, AND TO THE EXTENT IT'S CONSISTENT WITH
7	STATE LAW, TO ALIGN CIRM'S STANDARDS WITH THOSE
8	RECOMMENDED BY THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.
9	IT ALSO EXPANDS THE SCOPE OF PATIENT
10	REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES TO INCLUDE, NOT JUST TRAVEL
11	AND LODGING AND MEALS FOR THE PATIENTS THEMSELVES,
12	BUT FOR THEIR CAREGIVERS AS WELL IN RECOGNITION,
13	PARTICULARLY IN OUR CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT
14	PATIENTS MAY HAVE TO TRAVEL SOME DISTANCE IN ORDER
15	TO PARTICIPATE IN CLINICAL TRIALS, AND THAT THEIR
16	CAREGIVERS SHOULD ALSO BE ENTITLED TO REIMBURSEMENT
17	TO SUPPORT THE PATIENTS IN THOSE EFFORTS.
18	AND THEN, FINALLY, TO THE DISCUSSION
19	EARLIER, THE BOARD IS REQUIRED TO ADOPT STANDARDS
20	GOVERNING GENETIC RESEARCH. AND, AGAIN, THESE ARE
21	GENERALLY TO BE BASED ON STANDARDS ADOPTED BY THE
22	NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. J.T.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES.
24	COMMENTS ON THIS PAGE FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
25	MR. TORRES: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN. THE
	70

1	LANGUAGE ESPECIALLY IN RESPECT TO PATIENT EXPENSES
2	IS SOMETHING THAT I REALLY SUPPORTED AS WE WERE
3	DRAFTING THIS INITIATIVE. AND IT COMES FROM MY
4	EXPERIENCE AS THE VICE CHAIR OF ONE LEGACY, WHICH IS
5	PROBABLY ONE OF THE LARGEST ORGAN TRANSPLANT
6	FOUNDATIONS IN THE U.S. AND ARE HEADQUARTERED IN LOS
7	ANGELES. WE FUNDED A FOUNDATION THAT HELPS
8	REIMBURSE PATIENTS TO COME TO LOS ANGELES OR TO COME
9	TO OTHER REGIONAL CENTERS WHERE WE PROVIDE ORGAN
10	TRANSPLANTS BECAUSE LITERALLY THEY CAN'T AFFORD, AND
11	YET THEY NEED AN ORGAN. AND THEY'RE ON THE LIST AND
12	THEY'VE BEEN GRANTED PRIORITY ON THE LIST. ONCE
13	THEY REALIZE WHAT'S AT STAKE, A LOT OF THEM CAN'T
14	AFFORD TO TRAVEL THE DISTANCE. AND WHAT WE NEED TO
15	ALSO KEEP IN AS MANY CANCER PATIENTS AND OTHER
16	PATIENTS AS WELL HAVE CAREGIVERS WHO ARE IMPORTANT
17	TO THEIR CONTINUED WELL-BEING. AND THOSE EXPENSES
18	OUGHT TO BE REIMBURSED AS WELL.
19	AGAIN, ONCE WE BEGIN EXPANDING WITH THE
20	COMMUNITY CARE CLINICS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT EARLIER
21	AND BEFORE THAT HAPPENS, AS JAMES HAS INDICATED SO
22	WELL, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO HAVE PATIENTS TO COME
23	TO OTHER PARTS OF THE STATE WHERE THEY MIGHT NOT
24	LIVE, BUT MAY NEED A HOTEL, MAY NEED TO BRING THEIR
25	CAREGIVERS WITH THEM, AND WE OUGHT TO BE SENSITIVE

1	TO REIMBURSING THEM FOR THOSE TO MAKE IT EASY AS
2	POSSIBLE TO HAVE ACCESS TO OUR TREATMENTS.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, SENATOR
4	TORRES. OTHER COMMENTS?
5	DR. VUORI: THIS IS KRISTINA. I'M NOT
6	SURE IF THIS IS THE RIGHT TOPIC TO ASK THIS
7	QUESTION, BUT I'M JUST CURIOUS. ON THE TOPIC, ON
8	THE FEDERAL GRANTING SIDE, GRANTING AGENCIES SUCH AS
9	NIH HAVE STRUGGLED WITH THE TOPIC OF POTENTIALLY
10	FOREIGN ESPIONAGE IN R&D IN THIS COUNTRY. AND
11	RECENTLY SOME GUIDELINES HAVE BEEN ISSUED HOW
12	FEDERAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS AND FEDERAL AGENCIES
13	NEED TO BETTER PROTECT THE RESEARCH THAT'S CARRIED
14	OUT IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS BY FEDERAL FUNDING
15	AGAINST POTENTIALLY FOREIGN INFLUENCE AND ADVANTAGE
16	THAT THEY MIGHT BE MAKING. IS THIS SOMETHING THAT
17	CIRM ALSO NEEDS TO PAY ATTENTION TO?
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
19	QUESTION. JAMES, I THINK I SAW YOU SHAKING YOUR
20	HEAD IN AGREEMENT WHILE DR. VOURI WAS MAKING THAT
21	COMMENT. DO YOU HAVE ANY THOUGHTS ON THAT QUESTION?
22	MR. HARRISON: YEAH. I THINK THAT WOULD
23	BE IMPORTANT FOR CIRM TO CONSIDER AND CERTAINLY
24	WITHIN THE SCOPE OF STANDARDS THAT IT'S REQUIRED TO
25	ADOPT.

1	DR. VUORI: THANK YOU.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: VERY IMPORTANT. THANK
3	YOU VERY MUCH. OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
4	BOARD? OKAY.
5	DR. SANDMEYER: SHOULD THERE BE LINKS TO
6	THOSE RELEVANT WEBSITES ON OUR WEBSITE TO MAKE IT
7	MORE SPECIFIC OR IS THAT TOO CONFINING?
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JAMES.
9	MR. HARRISON: WELL, WE CERTAINLY COULD
10	INCLUDE LINKS. ONE OF THE CHALLENGES IS THAT BOTH
11	THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AS WELL AS NIH HAVE
12	A VARIETY OF DIFFERENT CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICIES
13	THAT APPLY TO DIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCES. SO EMPLOYEES
14	VERSUS REVIEWERS VERSUS STUDY GROUPS. SO IT CAN
15	SOMETIMES BE A LITTLE BIT CONFUSING TO NAVIGATE
16	THROUGH THOSE VARIOUS POLICIES TO DETERMINE WHICH
17	ONES ARE RELEVANT AND APPLICABLE FOR CIRM'S
18	PURPOSES. BUT CERTAINLY NO DOWNSIDE IN INCLUDING A
19	LINK GENERALLY TO THOSE CONFLICT POLICIES AS LONG AS
20	WE ARE CLEAR THAT THERE MAY BE SOME MORE RELEVANT
21	THAN OTHERS FOR CIRM'S PURPOSES.
22	DR. SANDMEYER: THIS MIGHT BE GOOD IF AN
23	EXPERT DID THAT NAVIGATION AS OPPOSED TO ROGUE
24	EXPERTS.
25	MR. HARRISON: A FAIR POINT.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. DEFINITELY
2	LOOK INTO THAT QUESTION IN MUCH MORE DETAIL. OTHER
3	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY. JAMES.
4	MR. HARRISON: WE'RE MAKING PROGRESS.
5	WE'RE ALMOST AT THE END.
6	LET'S TALK ABOUT THE FUNDING ALLOCATION.
7	SO OF THE \$5.5 BILLION, 95.5 PERCENT IS ALLOCATED
8	FOR GRANTS AND GRANT ADMINISTRATION, 3.5 PERCENT IS
9	EARMARKED FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, AND 1.5
10	PERCENT IS EARMARKED FOR THE COSTS OF THE
11	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY TEAM, UP TO 15
12	EMPLOYEES WHO WOULD SUPPORT THOSE EFFORTS.
13	OF THE FUNDS THAT ARE AVAILABLE FOR GRANTS
14	AND GRANT ADMINISTRATION, ONCE YOU CONDUCT ALL THE
15	CALCULATIONS, WHAT IT AMOUNTS TO IS THAT NO LESS
16	THAN \$4,707,283 IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH GRANTS.
17	UP TO APPROXIMATELY 96 MILLION IS AVAILABLE FOR
18	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY RESEARCH CONSULTING
19	GRANTS, WHICH I REFERENCED EARLIER. UP TO
20	78,112,500 IS FOR AVAILABLE FOR COMMUNITY CARE
21	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FACILITIES. SO THIS IS
22	FUNDING THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO CONSTRUCT AND
23	EQUIP AND OPERATE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF
24	EXCELLENCE. AND UP TO \$26 MILLION IS AVAILABLE FOR
25	THE CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT OF SHARED LABS,

1	INCLUDING THE SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT NECESSARY. AND
2	UP TO 165 MILLION IS AVAILABLE FOR GRANTS
3	ADMINISTRATION. J.T.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. COMMENTS,
5	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6	DR. VUORI: I DO HAVE A VERY QUICK
7	QUESTION. COULD YOU TELL ME AN EXAMPLE WHAT COSTS
8	BELONG TO GRANTS ADMINISTRATION CATEGORY AS OPPOSED
9	TO, FOR EXAMPLE, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION?
10	MR. HARRISON: YES. SO CIRM HAS DETAILED
11	FORMULAS TO ALLOCATE COSTS BETWEEN EMPLOYEES WHO ARE
12	INVOLVED IN GRANT REVIEW SPECIFICALLY AS OPPOSED TO
13	GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD. FOR EXAMPLE, A
14	PORTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S SALARY IS ALLOCATED TO
15	GRANT REVIEW AND A PORTION IS ALLOCATED TO GENERAL
16	ADMINISTRATION. AND THERE ARE MANY MORE DETAILS
17	THAT THE AGENCY'S CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER CAN
18	PROVIDE, BUT THEY'RE OUTSIDE OF MY EXPERTISE.
19	DR. VUORI: OKAY. GREAT. THANKS.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS?
21	DR. SANDMEYER: JUST TO CLARIFY, THAT'S
22	ALL CENTRAL GRANT ADMINISTRATION; IS THAT RIGHT?
23	MR. HARRISON: YES.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS? JAMES,
25	NEXT PAGE PLEASE.

1	MR. HARRISON: I WON'T PAUSE LONG ON THIS
2	SLIDE. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT IT MORE CLOSELY
3	ON YOUR OWN TIME, YOU ARE FREE TO DO SO. THE
4	ALLOCATION FORMULA IN PROP 14 IS RELATIVELY COMPLEX.
5	AND THIS SLIDE OUTLINES HOW WE ARRIVED AT THE
6	FIGURES ON THE PRECEDING SLIDE. J.T.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ANYBODY HAVE
8	ANY COMMENTS ON THIS? CAN ANYBODY READ THIS? START
9	WITH THAT QUESTION. ANY COMMENTS?
10	MS. DURON: I THINK IT'S AN EYE CHART AND
11	I FAILED.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
13	COMMENTS?
14	DR. VUORI: CLEAR AS MUD.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. HEARING NO
16	OTHERS, JAMES.
17	MR. HARRISON: SO THERE ARE SOME IMPORTANT
18	BOND ACT TERMS IN PROP 14 THAT I THINK ARE IMPORTANT
19	TO MENTION, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE CURRENT SITUATION
20	WE FIND OURSELVES IN WITH A RECESSION AND A
21	PANDEMIC. ONE OF THE REALLY IMPORTANT FEATURES THAT
22	BOB KLEIN INCLUDED IN PROP 14 WAS A REQUIREMENT THAT
23	BOND PROCEEDS BE USED TO PAY CAPITALIZED INTEREST
24	FOR THE FIRST FIVE YEARS. WHAT THIS MEANS IS THAT
25	THERE WILL BE NO PAYMENTS FOR PROP 14 OUT OF THE

1	GENERAL FUND UNTIL 2026 WHEN HOPEFULLY THE STATE
2	WILL BE IN A POSITION WHERE WE HAVE RECOVERED FROM
3	THE PANDEMIC AND THE RECESSION AND WE'LL BE BACK ON
4	A MORE SOLID ECONOMIC FOOTING.
5	IN THE MEANTIME THE STATE WILL EARN
6	REVENUES FROM THE RESEARCH CIRM FUNDS IN TERMS OF
7	THE TAX PROCEEDS TO THE GENERAL FUND. SO DURING
8	THIS PERIOD OF TIME, CIRM WILL HAVE A NET POSITIVE
9	IMPACT ON THE STATE GENERAL FUND, WHICH IS IMPORTANT
10	GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES WE FIND OURSELVES IN.
11	ANOTHER KEY THING FOR BOARD MEMBERS TO
12	UNDERSTAND IS THAT THE ACT PROHIBITS MORE THAN \$540
13	MILLION IN BONDS FROM BEING ISSUED IN ANY ONE YEAR.
14	WHAT THAT MEANS AS A PRACTICAL MATTER IS THAT THE
15	BONDS WILL BE SOLD OVER A MINIMUM OF 11 YEARS, AND
16	IN ALL LIKELIHOOD OVER A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME GIVEN
17	THE FACT THAT CIRM AWARDS FUNDS ON A MULTIYEAR
18	CYCLE. SO IF YOU THINK OF A FOUR-YEAR GRANT MADE IN
19	YEAR 11, IT'S LIKELY THAT BONDS WILL BE ISSUED OVER
20	A PERIOD OF AT LEAST 15 YEARS TO FUND ALL OF THE
21	AWARDS MADE PURSUANT TO THE \$5.5 BILLION BOND
22	ALLOCATION.
23	ONE FINAL NOTE HERE. UNDER PROP 71 LOAN
24	PROCEEDS WERE RETURNED TO CIRM, BUT WERE LIMITED TO
25	BE USED FOR THE PURPOSES OF MAKING ADDITIONAL

1	AWARDS. PROP 14 EXPANDS CIRM'S AUTHORITY TO USE
2	LOAN PROCEEDS FOR THE PURPOSES OF MAKING ADDITIONAL
3	AWARDS AS WELL AS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: COUPLE OF COMMENTS HERE.
5	FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE
6	FINANCIALLY ESOTERIC TERM "CAPITALIZED INTEREST,"
7	WHAT THAT SIMPLY MEANS IS THE AMOUNT OF THE DEBT
8	SERVICE FOR THE FIRST FIVE YEARS IS ACTUALLY ADDED
9	AS PART OF THE BOND ISSUE. SO YOU'RE PAYING FOR
10	DEBT SERVICE OUT OF BOND PROCEEDS ITSELF, WHICH IS
11	WHY THERE WILL BE NO PAYMENTS FROM THE GENERAL FUND
12	FOR THOSE FIRST FIVE YEARS.
13	SECOND POINT OF NOTE, AND, DR. MILLAN,
14	CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG ON THIS, WHEN WE GET TO THIS
15	NOTION OF NO MORE THAN 540 MILLION IN BONDS
16	ANNUALLY, I THINK THE HIGHEST AMOUNT WE'VE ISSUED IN
17	ANY GIVEN YEAR IS 330, SOMETHING LIKE THAT. DOES
18	THAT SOUND ABOUT RIGHT?
19	DR. MILLAN: AROUND THE BALLPARK.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: RIGHT. SO GETTING UP TO
21	540 IN A YEAR WOULD ENTAIL CONSIDERABLY MORE THAN
22	WE'VE EVER FUNDED. HAVING SAID THAT, AS WE GET MORE
23	AND MORE CLINICAL AWARDS, WHICH ARE THE MOST
24	EXPENSIVE, THAT WILL RAISE THE AMOUNT. BUT GETTING
25	TO 540 WOULD BE A MAJOR DEPARTURE FROM WHAT WE'VE

1	DONE TO THIS POINT.
2	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
3	HEARING NONE, JAMES.
4	MR. HARRISON: THIS IS THE LAST SLIDE.
5	UNDER PROP 71, WHEN ROYALTIES ARISE FROM CIRM-FUNDED
6	RESEARCH, PURSUANT TO CIRM'S IP POLICIES, CIRM'S
7	GRANTEES ARE REQUIRED TO MAKE THOSE PAYMENTS TO THE
8	STATE GENERAL FUNNEL. SO THEY DON'T RETURN TO CIRM.
9	THEY RETURN TO THE STATE GENERAL FUND, AND THEN
10	THEY'RE APPROPRIATED FOR ANY GENERAL FUND PURPOSE.
11	PROP 14 EARMARKS THOSE FUNDS SO THAT ONCE
12	THEY ARRIVE AT THE STATE TREASURER'S OFFICE, THEY
13	ARE SEGREGATED AND MADE AVAILABLE FOR APPROPRIATION
14	FOR THE PURPOSES OF SUPPORTING THE ABILITY OF
15	CALIFORNIANS WHO HAVE INSUFFICIENT MEANS TO OBTAIN
16	ACCESS TO CIRM-FUNDED TREATMENTS AND CURES AS WELL
17	AS TO CIRM-FUNDED TRIALS, INCLUDING REIMBURSING THE
18	KINDS OF PATIENT COSTS WE'VE REFERENCED EARLIER.
19	J.T.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES.
21	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
22	MS. DURON: J.T., ARE THESE THE KINDS OF
23	FUNDS THAT WILL ACCRUE BACK SOMETHING LIKE THE CARE
24	CENTERS WHERE WE'LL PROBABLY BE SERVING THE MOST
25	VULNERABLE SO THEY KNOW THAT THERE'S THIS, MAYBE NOT

1	A CONTINUING FUND, BUT THAT THEY CAN LOOK TO THAT
2	FOR MORE SUPPORT? I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE MECHANISMS
3	ARE TO GET THIS MONEY BACK INTO SERVICE, IF YOU
4	WILL.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: RIGHT. JAMES, WOULD YOU
6	WANT TO ADDRESS THAT, AND I HAVE A GENERAL COMMENT
7	AFTER YOUR ANSWER HERE.
8	MR. HARRISON: CERTAINLY. SO THOUGH THESE
9	FUNDS ARE EARMARKED AND THEREBY SEGREGATED, THEIR
10	USE IS RESTRICTED, BUT THEY WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE
11	ANNUAL BUDGET APPROPRIATION PROCESS, MEANING THE
12	GOVERNOR'S OFFICE WILL PROPOSE A BUDGET THAT WILL
13	INCLUDE THE APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS THAT HAVE ACCRUED
14	IN THIS ACCOUNT. AND THEN THAT BUDGET PROPOSAL WILL
15	BE REVIEWED AND ULTIMATELY APPROVED BY THE
16	LEGISLATURE.
17	CIRM WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO
18	INFLUENCE THAT PROCESS BY PROPOSING THE HIGHEST AND
19	BEST USE OF THOSE FUNDS TO THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.
20	SO WE'VE ALREADY HAD SOME INITIAL DISCUSSIONS WITH
21	THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE. THEY ARE IN THE PROCESS
22	OF SETTING UP THIS SPECIAL ACCOUNT TO MAKE SURE THAT
23	THE FUNDS CAN BE TRACKED SO THAT THEY CAN BE
24	APPROPRIATED FOR THE BEST AND HIGHEST PURPOSES.
25	MS. DURON: I THINK IT'S VERY CRUCIAL.
	20

1	AND HOPEFULLY THIS COMES THROUGH THE COMMUNICATIONS
2	DEPARTMENT THAT WE ALSO RECOGNIZE WHAT MONEY IS
3	GOING BACK TO SERVE THE PUBLIC. BECAUSE I THINK
4	THAT QUESTION HAS ARISEN DURING THE CAMPAIGN AS
5	WELL. WHAT'S IN IT FOR ME, KIND OF I HAVEN'T HEARD
6	HOW THIS HAS HELPED THE COMMUNITIES, PATIENTS, ET
7	CETERA. I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY GOOD TO SPOTLIGHT
8	HOW THESE FUNDS ARE GOING BACK TO HELP THE COMMUNITY
9	SO THAT PEOPLE WILL UNDERSTAND AND IT'S VERY OPEN,
10	AUTHENTIC, AND TRANSPARENT. THANKS.
11	DR. SANDMEYER: SO WOULD THIS INCLUDE
12	FUNDS FROM THE LAST BOND ISSUE? AND SO HOW MUCH ARE
13	WE TALKING ABOUT? WOULD THOSE FUNDS BE REDIRECTED?
14	MR. HARRISON: SO THE EXTENT THAT THE
15	GENERAL FUND HAS, PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF
15 16	GENERAL FUND HAS, PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE
	, and the second
16	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE
16 17	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED
16 17 18	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED ON OR AFTER DECEMBER 16, 2020, WHICH WAS THE
16 17 18 19	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED ON OR AFTER DECEMBER 16, 2020, WHICH WAS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROP 14, WILL NOW BE EARMARKED FOR
16 17 18 19 20	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED ON OR AFTER DECEMBER 16, 2020, WHICH WAS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROP 14, WILL NOW BE EARMARKED FOR THIS PURPOSE. I THINK IT'S DIFFICULT TO ANTICIPATE
16 17 18 19 20 21	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED ON OR AFTER DECEMBER 16, 2020, WHICH WAS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROP 14, WILL NOW BE EARMARKED FOR THIS PURPOSE. I THINK IT'S DIFFICULT TO ANTICIPATE THE LEVEL OF FUTURE FUNDING THAT MIGHT BE GENERATED
16 17 18 19 20 21	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED ON OR AFTER DECEMBER 16, 2020, WHICH WAS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROP 14, WILL NOW BE EARMARKED FOR THIS PURPOSE. I THINK IT'S DIFFICULT TO ANTICIPATE THE LEVEL OF FUTURE FUNDING THAT MIGHT BE GENERATED BECAUSE IT DEPENDS UPON THE SUCCESS OF BOTH EXISTING
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	PROP 14, RECEIVED FUNDS, THOSE FUNDS WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN APPROPRIATED. BUT ANY FUNDS RECEIVED ON OR AFTER DECEMBER 16, 2020, WHICH WAS THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROP 14, WILL NOW BE EARMARKED FOR THIS PURPOSE. I THINK IT'S DIFFICULT TO ANTICIPATE THE LEVEL OF FUTURE FUNDING THAT MIGHT BE GENERATED BECAUSE IT DEPENDS UPON THE SUCCESS OF BOTH EXISTING AND NEW PROGRAMS THAT CIRM FUNDS, BUT CERTAINLY

1	OF SUPPORTING PATIENTS.
2	DR. SANDMEYER: DO WE KNOW WHAT THE AMOUNT
3	WAS FOR THE PAST BOND ISSUE? I REALIZE THAT IS A
4	CHALLENGING NUMBER TO DERIVE.
5	MR. HARRISON: YES. TO DATE, AND DR.
6	MILLAN CORRECT ME IF MY NUMBER IS INCORRECT, BUT I
7	BELIEVE THE STATE HAS REALIZED APPROXIMATELY
8	\$350,000 IN ROYALTY REVENUE. SO IT'S A BEEN A SMALL
9	AMOUNT TO DATE, BUT THAT, OF COURSE, IS A FUNCTION
10	OF THE TIMELINE TO DEVELOP NEW THERAPIES. SO I
11	THINK WE CAN ANTICIPATE STRONGER RETURNS IN THE
12	FUTURE.
13	DR. SANDMEYER: THANK YOU.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AND THAT WAS GOING TO BE
15	MY GENERAL COMMENT, THAT THIS WILL BECOME
16	INCREASINGLY RELEVANT AS THE FIELD MATURES AND OUR
17	PROJECTS GET FURTHER ALONG AND WE GET MORE INTO
18	COMMERCIALIZED PRODUCT FORM WHICH GENERATES
19	ROYALTIES, ETC. SO THIS IS SOMETHING THAT'S GOING
20	TO PLAY OUT OVER A PERIOD OF TIME IN A PRESUMABLY
21	ESCALATING FASHION AND WE'LL HAVE MORE AND MORE
22	FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR THIS PARTICULAR PURPOSE.
23	OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
24	DR. VUORI: I APOLOGIZE IF I MISSED THIS,
25	BUT WHAT IS THE FORMULA NOW HOW ROYALTIES WILL BE

1	CALCULATED? IS IT ON SALES ONLY, OR IS THERE AN
2	INFLECTION POINT AND A COMMERCIALIZATION EVENT
3	EARLIER THAN ACTUAL SALES THAT RESULTS IN SOME
4	RETURN ON INVESTMENT TO THE STATE?
5	MR. HARRISON: THE CURRENT IP POLICIES
6	IMPOSE REVENUE SHARING REQUIREMENTS ON
7	COMMERCIALIZING ENTITIES UPON COMMERCIALIZATION AT A
8	RATE OF .1 PERCENT PER ONE MILLION OF CIRM FUNDING.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANY OTHER
10	COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
11	HEARING NONE, JAMES, I THINK YOU SAID THIS WAS THE
12	FINAL PAGE. I WANT TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH, NOT JUST
13	FOR PUTTING THIS PRESENTATION TOGETHER, BUT FOR THE
14	INSTRUMENTAL ROLE THAT YOU HAD WITH BOB AND ART IN
15	NOT ONLY DRAFTING THIS MEASURE, BUT YOU GO BACK AND
16	HAVING WITH BOB DRAFTED PROP 71 AS WELL, THE AMOUNT
17	OF EFFORT THAT WENT INTO THIS CAN'T POSSIBLY BE
18	OVERSTATED. AND I THINK THAT THE PRODUCT HERE THAT
19	IS EMBODIED IN PROP 14 WILL ENABLE CIRM TO TAKE ITS
20	ALREADY OUTSTANDING PROGRAM TO GREATER HEIGHTS. AND
21	JUST WANTED TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR ALL OF YOUR
22	WORK IN THIS AND IN YOUR CONTINUED EXPERTISE THAT
23	YOU LEND TO THIS WHOLE GRAND MISSION. AND SO ON
24	BEHALF OF THE BOARD, THANKS SO MUCH.
25	MR. TORRES: I JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU

1	AS WELL TO JAMES. IT WAS QUITE AN EXPERIENCE
2	WORKING WITH HIM AND BOB OVER THE PROCESS THIS NEW
3	INITIATIVE WAS BEING DRAFTED. THANK GOD WE ARE
4	LUCKY TO HAVE THE EXPERTISE THAT JAMES PROVIDES TO
5	US, NOT ONLY IN THAT PROCESS, BUT ALSO SUBSEQUENTLY
6	AS WELL. SO THANK YOU, JAMES.
7	MR. HARRISON: THANKS TO BOTH OF YOU AND
8	TO THE BOARD.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO BEFORE WE GET
10	TO DR. MILLAN, BETH HAS BEEN TIRELESSLY WORKING AWAY
11	TRANSCRIBING FOR OVER A COUPLE HOURS. I WANT TO
12	GIVE HER A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK HERE. SO WE WILL BE
13	BACK WITH YOU IN A FEW.
14	(A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)
14 15	(A RECESS WAS TAKEN.) CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY.
15 16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW.
15 16 17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION.
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION. DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION. DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. THAT WAS A REALLY VERY
15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION. DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. THAT WAS A REALLY VERY PRODUCTIVE AND INFORMATIVE DISCUSSION, AND WE'RE
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION. DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. THAT WAS A REALLY VERY PRODUCTIVE AND INFORMATIVE DISCUSSION, AND WE'RE TAKING NOTES.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION. DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. THAT WAS A REALLY VERY PRODUCTIVE AND INFORMATIVE DISCUSSION, AND WE'RE TAKING NOTES. THIS SECTION OF THE MEETING, WHAT THE TEAM
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. WELCOME BACK. WE ARE BACK LIVE ON THE AIR NOW. GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO DR. MILLAN'S PRESENTATION. DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. THAT WAS A REALLY VERY PRODUCTIVE AND INFORMATIVE DISCUSSION, AND WE'RE TAKING NOTES. THIS SECTION OF THE MEETING, WHAT THE TEAM AND I HOPE TO DO IS PROVIDE SOME INFORMATION,

1	COMPONENTS OF PROP 14 WHICH JAMES HAD OUTLINED.
2	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, GEOFF. THANKS, GEOFF,
3	FOR DRIVING THE SLIDES.
4	BUT BEFORE THAT, I WANTED TO GIVE THIS
5	KIND OF CONTEXT, MAYBE EVEN SEQUENCE AND TIMING, IN
6	TERMS OF TACTICALLY AND STRATEGICALLY HOW WE ARE
7	LAUNCHING PROP 14. AND YOU WILL SEE THAT SOME
8	ELEMENTS WILL BE FAMILIAR TO YOU BECAUSE THEY ARE
9	SOME OF THE COMPONENTS THAT WERE MENTIONED IN THE
10	PRESENTATION BY JAMES AND IN THE DISCUSSIONS IN THE
11	PREVIOUS SECTION OF THIS MEETING.
12	SO THIS WILL GIVE US AN IDEA OF WHERE SOME
13	OF THESE ELEMENTS ARE ALREADY BEING CONSIDERED, SOME
14	INITIAL STEPS ALREADY BEING TAKEN IN THOSE
15	PARTICULAR COMPONENTS, BUT TO SAY THAT THE CONCEPTS
16	ARE STILL AND THE STRATEGIC PLAN IS STILL IN
17	DEVELOPMENT. AND SO I WANTED TO JUST GO AHEAD AND
18	LAY THOSE OUT SO THAT WE HAVE A SENSE THAT, EVEN IN
19	THE PRESENTATION TODAY, WE'RE NOT BRINGING ANY
20	CONCEPT PROPOSALS TO THE BOARD, THERE WILL BE NO
21	BOARD ACTION. WHAT WE HOPE TO DO IS GIVE CONTEXT IN
22	TERMS OF WHERE THESE PARTICULAR ELEMENTS FALL IN OUR
23	ONE-YEAR ACTIVITY.
24	SO CURRENTLY WE HAVE OPEN PROGRAM
25	ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR DISC2, WHICH IS CANDIDATE

1	DISCOVERY, TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH, TRAN, AND
2	CLINICAL STAGE RESEARCH. AND ALL OF THESE ACTUALLY
3	ALL WILL TAKE IN CNS RESEARCH PROPOSALS. SO THAT'S
4	JUST KIND OF A REALLY IMPORTANT STARTING POINT, AND
5	THESE LEGACY PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN RELAUNCHED AS
6	APPROVED BY THE ICOC WITH CONCEPT CHANGES AND
7	AMENDMENT THAT CORRECT FOR THINGS THAT NEEDED TO BE
8	CORRECTED, UPDATE THEM, AND ALREADY INSERT STRATEGIC
9	ELEMENTS SUCH AS DATA SHARING AND DIVERSITY, EQUITY,
10	AND INCLUSION PLANS. THIS IS THE FIRST STEP. IT
11	WILL NOT BE THE END OF IT. THIS WILL CONTINUE TO
12	EVOLVE, BUT ALL OF THOSE WERE APPROVED BY THE BOARD.
13	SO THOSE PROGRAMS ARE CURRENTLY OPEN.
14	SO THE WHOLE PROCESS OF REVIEW AND THEN
15	BRINGING THEM TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL WILL BE
16	OCCURRING IN THE FIRST TWO QUARTERS OF THIS YEAR.
17	THERE WILL BE CONVERSATION ABOUT EDUCATION
18	PROGRAMS, WHICH INCLUDE THE BRIDGES PROGRAM,
19	TRAINING, LAB-BASED PROGRAMS, AND SPARK PROGRAMS.
20	AND THAT WILL BE PRESENTED BY DR. KELLY SHEPARD, WHO
21	HAS BEEN REALLY SPEARHEADING THE MANAGEMENT OF THESE
22	PROGRAMS. SHE WILL BE GIVING AN OVERVIEW OF THAT.
23	IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, THESE CONCEPTS ARE A LITTLE
24	BIT FURTHER ALONG, AND WE ARE SEEKING YOUR INPUT
25	BECAUSE POTENTIALLY, DEPENDING ON HOW YOU VIEW THESE

1	PROGRAMS, THEY WILL BE BROUGHT TO THE FEBRUARY
2	MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION FOR OPENING AND A BUDGET
3	ASSOCIATED WITH THAT.
4	WE ARE CURRENTLY A VERY SMALL ORGANIZATION
5	RIGHT NOW. WE WERE, AS YOU KNOW, LAST YEAR KIND OF
6	IN A WIND-DOWN MODE WITH REALLY A SKELETON CREW THAT
7	REALLY DID SOME REMARKABLE THINGS IN TERMS OF
8	MANAGING THE FINAL PROGRAMS UNDER THE REMAINING PROP
9	71 FUNDS AS WELL AS THE EMERGENCY COVID PROGRAM AND
10	THE SICKLE CELL PROGRAM AND THEN EVERYTHING ELSE IN
11	BETWEEN TO RUN OPERATIONS OF THE AGENCY. AND SO
12	THAT SAME TEAM IS WHO'S LAUNCHING THESE VERY ROBUST
13	PROGRAMS RIGHT NOW. SO WE NEED TIME TO BUILD THE
14	PERSONNEL.
15	SO WE'RE CURRENTLY IN A VERY LARGE
16	EXPANSION OF OUR EFFORT, BUT THIS NEEDS TO BE DONE
17	STRATEGICALLY AS WELL TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE GONE
18	THROUGH THE PROCESS OF REALLY BRINGING IN THE BEST
19	TEAM MEMBERS TO SUPPORT THESE EFFORTS ALONG WITH OUR
20	CURRENT MEMBERS.
21	AND BECAUSE OF THESE NEW PROGRAM
22	ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NEW ELEMENTS, SUCH AS DATA
23	SHARING, AND DEI AND OTHER ASPECTS THAT HAVE BEEN
24	BROUGHT INTO EVEN THESE CURRENT PROGRAM
25	ANNOUNCEMENTS, THERE ARE OPERATIONAL UPDATES,

1	ADDITIONS, AND POLICIES THAT NEED TO BE BROUGHT UP
2	TO SPEED TO SUPPORT THESE PROGRAMS AS WELL AS TEE US
3	UP FOR WHAT'S COMING IN THE UPCOMING REST OF THIS
4	YEAR AND, WHERE WE CAN, BE READY TO BE IN THE BEST
5	POSITION TO LAUNCH THE FORMAL FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC
6	PLAN.
7	WE ALSO EXPECT, SO THE END OF FEBRUARY,
8	THE JOINT PRESIDENT CHAIR SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL
9	WILL MEET. WE HAVE ASSEMBLED A VERY AUGUST GROUP OF
10	EXPERTS IN THE FIELD SPANNING A WIDE BREADTH OF
11	EXPERTISE, AND WE WILL BE HAVING A CONVERSATION
12	ABOUT SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM SCOPE, ALL OF THE KIND OF
13	CONVERSATIONS THAT OCCURRED EARLIER IN THE MEETING
14	IN TERMS OF WHAT ARE POTENTIAL VITAL RESEARCH
15	OPPORTUNITIES, EVALUATING WHERE WE CURRENTLY ARE
16	WITH OUR PROGRAMS, AND THEN DETERMINING WHAT THE
17	SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND LEADERSHIP IN THAT
18	COMMUNITY BROADLY FEEL ARE UNIQUE AND IMPORTANT
19	OPPORTUNITIES FOR CIRM TO CONSIDER. AND THOSE WILL
20	BE BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR MORE DISCUSSION SO THAT
21	WE COULD REFINE EVEN EXISTING PROGRAMS WITH REGARD
22	TO SCOPE, FOR INSTANCE, OR OTHER ASPECTS OF THE
23	PROGRAM.
24	THE SHARED LABS WAS ALSO MENTIONED IN THE
25	PROP 14 COMPONENTS. AND WHAT WE EXPECT IS, IN

1	ADDITION TO JUST BRINGING THAT UP TO CURRENT
2	STANDARDS AND MAKING REFINEMENTS, IMPROVEMENTS,
3	GAINING INPUT FROM THE STAKEHOLDERS, WE HOPE TO BE
4	ABLE TO BRING A CONCEPT PROPOSAL TO THE BOARD BY THE
5	THIRD QUARTER OF THIS YEAR AND LAUNCH THE PROGRAM
6	LATER IN THE YEAR.
7	AND THEN IN PARALLEL TO ALL THIS, WE ARE
8	CONTINUING A VERY, VERY AGGRESSIVE PACE TO REALLY
9	DEVELOP CONCEPTS AND THE STRATEGIC CONCEPTS THAT
10	HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO THE BOARD AND BRINGING THOSE TO
11	SOMETHING THAT CAN LEAD TO THE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC
12	PLAN. THAT FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN WILL INCLUDE
13	NEW ELEMENTS, INCLUDING WHAT FUTURE APPROACHES COULD
14	WE TAKE TO LEVERAGE AND CAPITALIZE ON OUR
15	OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPORT THE SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS FROM
16	DISCOVERY ALL THE WAY THROUGH TO CLINICAL AND BEYOND
17	AND OTHER RESEARCH THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH THAT,
18	INCLUDING PROMINENTLY CNS DISEASE.
19	AND THEN THE NEW INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS,
20	WE MENTIONED THE ALPHA CLINICS EXPANSION AND THE
21	COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE. THANK YOU SO
22	MUCH FOR THE AMAZING INPUT ALREADY. WE WILL LOOK
23	FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THE BOARD AS THOSE CONCEPTS
24	ARE BEING DEVELOPED.
25	AND THEN IN ADDITION TO THE EDUCATION
	00

1	PROGRAMS THAT YOU'LL BE HEARING ABOUT FROM DR.
2	SHEPARD, YOU WILL BE SEEING REFLECTED A NEW PROGRAM,
3	SOME OF THE ONES THAT WERE ASKED ABOUT, INCLUDING BY
4	DR. MELMED, IN TERMS OF THINGS SUCH AS FORMAL
5	FELLOWSHIPS THAT TRAIN AND CERTIFY SPECIALISTS IN
6	THE FIELD IN THE CLINICAL RESEARCH AND OTHERWISE,
7	BUT ALSO AT VARIOUS ONRAMPS FOR EARLIER STAGE
8	SESSIONS AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEVEL, OUR BRIDGES
9	PROGRAMS, AND OTHER KIND OF ONRAMP ENTRY POINTS FOR
10	SPECIALIZED TRACTS. SO YOU WILL START TO SEE THOSE
11	START TO ROLL OUT AFTER THE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN
12	HAS BEEN FINALIZED.
13	AND THEN THERE ARE ADDITIONAL CONCEPTS,
14	UNFORTUNATELY IT'S CUT OFF, BUT AT THE VERY BOTTOM
15	IT TALKS ABOUT NOVEL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AND SOME
16	OF THOSE CONCEPTS THAT WERE MENTIONED EARLIER ABOUT
17	NONSCIENTIFIC RESEARCH THAT WILL INFORM
18	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY. WE EXPECT THAT
19	WE'LL GET DIRECTION FROM THE ACCESSIBILITY AND
20	AFFORDABILITY WORK GROUP AND THE BOARD IN TERMS OF
21	HOW WE COULD IMPLEMENT SOME IMPORTANT PROGRAMS THAT
22	WILL BRING THOSE GOALS FORWARD.
23	AND THEN THE OTHER ELEMENTS HERE IN GRAY
24	ARE IMPORTANT. THEY'RE NOT GRAYED BECAUSE THEY'RE
25	NOT IMPORTANT. THEY'RE IN VERY MATURE STAGES OF

1	BEING DEVELOPED. THEY'VE BEEN THE TOPIC OF MANY OF
2	OUR ADVISORY INPUT AND AT BOARD MEETINGS, AND YOU
3	MAY HAVE SEEN SOME OF THOSE THEMES ARISE AS WE GO
4	THROUGH THE PRESENTATIONS TODAY.
5	SO ONE OF THE REASONS WHY I WANTED TO PUT
6	THIS, AND HOPEFULLY IT'S NOT AN OVERCROWDED SLIDE,
7	BUT IS JUST TO REALLY KIND OF LAY OUT WHAT THE
8	SEQUENCE OF EVENTS ARE, WHAT THE TIMING IS, AND THAT
9	ALL OF THESE ELEMENTS ARE BEING CONSIDERED. IT'S
10	JUST THAT THEY'RE AT VARIOUS STAGES OF CONCEPT
11	DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE, FRANKLY, FOR CONCEPTS SUCH AS
12	THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, FOR
13	INSTANCE, THERE NEEDS TO BE MUCH MORE INPUT. SOME
14	OF THE SUGGESTIONS FROM EARLIER TODAY ARE VERY MUCH
15	HEARD. I THINK THEY WOULD BE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
16	THAT THIS IS DEVELOPED ALONG WITH THE COMMUNITY
17	STAKEHOLDERS, THAT IT IS DESIGNED APPROPRIATELY, AND
18	IT DOES NOT HAVE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF GOING
19	AGAINST THE SPIRIT OF WHY THESE COMMUNITY CARE
20	CENTERS ARE BEING PUT IN PLACE. SO IT NEEDS TO BE
21	VERY WELL INFORMED.
22	ANYWAY, I WOULD LIKE TO JUST GO AHEAD AND
23	PAUSE THERE, CHAIRMAN THOMAS, TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS
24	ABOUT JUST WHAT'S PRESENTED ON THIS SLIDE. AND THEN
25	I'M FORTUNATE TO HAVE MY COLLEAGUES THEN PRESENT

1	SOME BACKGROUND MATERIAL ON VARIOUS TOPICS. WE'LL
2	START WITH ALPHA CLINICS, THEN THE EDUCATION
3	PROGRAMS, THE SHARED LABS, A DISCUSSION ABOUT SCOPE
4	AND VRO TOPICS THAT WERE MENTIONED BEFORE, BUT
5	ACTUALLY BRINGING UP SOME EXAMPLES OR THINGS THAT
6	THE CIRM TEAM KIND OF ALREADY HAS IN FRONT OF THEM,
7	AND THEN THE CNS PROGRAM. I MAY HAVE MISSED ONE,
8	BUT GENERALLY THAT'S HOW THE SEQUENCE WILL GO, JUST
9	TO FOLLOW WHAT JAMES HARRISON'S PRESENTATION WAS.
10	THANK YOU. CHAIRMAN THOMAS.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MR. MILLAN.
12	MY ONLY COMMENT BEFORE OPENING UP HERE, IS IN
13	FURTHER DISCUSSION WITH DR. MILLAN AND THE TEAM AND
14	BEING AWARE OF THE FACT THAT WE NEED TO BRING ON
15	ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE CRITICAL
16	INPUT. AND IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT THE AAWG IS
17	GOING TO TAKE PERIOD OF TIME TO GET UP AND RUNNING,
18	IT WAS OUR COLLECTIVE JUDGMENT THAT THE GOAL FOR
19	ARRIVING AT THE STRATEGIC PLAN, WHICH WE HAD
20	ORIGINALLY THOUGHT WOULD BE MIDYEAR, WE COLLECTIVELY
21	MOVED TO THE END OF THE YEAR TO GIVE EVERYBODY A
22	CHANCE TO DO EVERYTHING THEY NEED TO MAKE IT AS
23	FULLY INFORMED AS POSSIBLE. AND AS WE'VE STATED
24	BEFORE, THE BOARD WILL BE INTEGRALLY INVOLVED AS WE
25	GO ALONG AT EACH STEP.

1	SO HAVING JUST NOTED THAT, ANY COMMENTS ON
2	THIS PAGE BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY. THANK
3	YOU. DR. MILLAN, PLEASE CONTINUE.
4	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU. AND WE'LL END
5	WITH THIS SLIDE SO THAT, IN CASE THERE ARE QUESTIONS
6	THAT ARISE LATER, YOU'LL HAVE A LITTLE BIT MORE
7	CONTEXT.
8	SO I'M PLEASED TO INTRODUCE GEOFF LOMAX,
9	WHO'S BEEN THE PROGRAM MANAGER MANAGING OUR ALPHA
10	CLINICS NETWORK WHO WILL BE PROVIDING AN UPDATE SO
11	THAT YOU HAVE A SENSE OF WHAT THE INITIAL PROGRAM
12	LOOKS LIKE. AND IT, AGAIN, SERVES AS MATERIALS SO
13	THAT YOU CAN HAVE A MORE FULL DISCUSSION ABOUT THE
14	ALPHA CLINICS EXPANSION COMPONENT OF PROP 14. THANK
15	YOU. GO AHEAD PLEASE.
16	DR. LOMAX: THANK YOU, DR. MILLAN,
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS. QUICK SOUND CHECK. AM I COMING IN
18	LOUD AND CLEAR? THANKS A LOT.
19	MY NAME IS GEOFF LOMAX. I'M THE PROGRAM
20	MANAGER FOR THE CIRM ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS
21	NETWORK. I WILL PROVIDE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE
22	NETWORK AND THE ROLE IT PLAYS IN SUPPORTING PATIENT
23	ACCESS TO STEM CELL AND GENE THERAPY TREATMENTS.
24	INITIATED IN 2015, THE ALPHA CLINICS ARE A
25	STATEWIDE NETWORK OF MEDICAL CENTERS DEDICATED TO

1	THE DELIVERY OF CLINICAL TRIALS. THE NETWORK
2	PROVIDES PATIENT-CENTERED CARE WHILE ACCELERATING
3	CELL AND GENE THERAPY CLINICAL TRIALS. CIRM FUNDING
4	SUPPORTS TEAMS THAT ARE ABLE TO WORK ACROSS RESEARCH
5	UNITS IRRESPECTIVE OF INDICATION OR DISEASE
6	CONDITION TO SUPPORT THE UNIQUE NEED OF STEM CELL
7	CLINICAL TRIALS. THESE TEAMS INCLUDE PATIENT
8	EDUCATORS AND NAVIGATORS WHO ARE FOCUSED ON THE
9	UNIQUE ATTRIBUTES OF STEM CELL TREATMENTS,
10	TECHNICIANS WITH EXPERTISE IN CELL MANUFACTURING AND
11	PROCESSING, PROVIDING THE CAPACITY TO HANDLE A RANGE
12	OF CELL-BASED TREATMENTS CONSISTENT WITH FDA
13	REQUIREMENTS, AND, OF COURSE, DOCTORS AND NURSES
14	WITH TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE IN CLINICAL RESEARCH
15	AND THE DELIVERY OF STEM CELL-BASED TREATMENT
16	PROTOCOLS, AND THE SUBSEQUENT PATIENT FOLLOW-UP.
17	IN ADDITION, CIRM AND THE ALPHA CLINIC
18	SITES HAVE WORKED COLLABORATIVELY OVER THE PAST FIVE
19	PLUS YEARS TO CREATE NETWORK SYNERGY. WE'VE
20	DEVELOPED STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES,
21	ACCELERATING TOOLS, AND KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS RESULTING
22	IN A TRACK RECORD OF SUCCESS. THIS TRACK RECORD
23	INCLUDES OVER 105 CLINICAL TRIALS, A MAJORITY BEING
24	INDUSTRY SPONSORED.
25	IN TERMS OF VALUE PROPOSITION, INDUSTRY

1	SPONSORS CITE RECRUITMENT TOOLS, SUCH AS COVAR
2	IDENTIFICATION DATABASES; REGULATORY ALIGNMENT, SUCH
3	AS THE NETWORK'S IRB RELIANCE AGREEMENT; TECHNICAL
4	EXPERTISE AND PROFICIENCY IN PRODUCT MANUFACTURING
5	AND PROCESSING; AND THE ABILITY TO DELIVER CLINICAL
6	CARE WITH A COMPARATIVELY LOW RATE OF PROTOCOL
7	DEVIATION.
8	SO TO ILLUSTRATE HOW THESE PIECES COME
9	TOGETHER, I'LL PROVIDE A COUPLE OF EXAMPLES OF
10	TRIALS BEING RUN WITHIN THE NETWORK. THE FIRST IS
11	AVITA BIOMEDICAL. AVITA'S PHASE 2 GLIOBLASTOMA
12	PROGRAM INVOLVES AUTOLOGOUS DENDRITIC CELLS LOADED
13	WITH IMMUNE FACTORS TARGETING THE TUMOR.
14	IN THE SECOND HALF OF 2018, THE COMPANY
15	WAS ABLE TO INITIATE THREE ALPHA CLINIC SITES, UC
16	IRVINE, UC DAVIS, AND UC SAN DIEGO UTILIZED THE
17	NETWORK'S SMART IRB RELIANCE AGREEMENT TO ACHIEVE A
18	60-DAY TRIAL ACTIVATION. IN THE END, AVITA REPORTED
19	COMPLETE ENROLLMENT IN FEBRUARY 2020, AND THE ASCC
20	SITES ACHIEVED THEIR ENROLLMENT OBJECTIVES.
21	A SECOND EXAMPLE IS DR. MICHAEL MATTHAY'S
22	CIRM-FUNDED COVID AWARD. THIS RANDOMIZED CONTROL
23	TRIAL USES ALLOGENEIC BONE MARROW-DERIVED
24	MESENCHYMAL CELLS IN COVID-19 PATIENTS ENCOUNTERING
24 25	MESENCHYMAL CELLS IN COVID-19 PATIENTS ENCOUNTERING RESPIRATORY DISTRESS. THIS IS ACTUALLY A NATIONAL

1	TRIAL, BUT IT'S ALSO OPENED AT TWO ALPHA CLINIC
2	SITES, UCSF AND UC DAVIS, WITH UCSF OPENING THE
3	TRIAL AT SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL, WHICH IS THE PRIMARY
4	HOSPITAL FOR THE CITY'S UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
5	DAVIS WAS AMONG THE FIRST SITES TO OPEN NATIONALLY
6	AND HAS SCREENED AND TREATED PATIENTS AS WELL.
7	IN BOTH THESE EXAMPLES NETWORK
8	ACCELERATING TOOLS WERE UTILIZED TO OPEN TRIALS
9	QUICKLY AND INITIATE PATIENT TREATMENT AT MULTIPLE
10	SITES.
11	THE ALPHA CLINICS ALSO REPRESENTS AN
12	OUTSTANDING TRAINING PLATFORM. FROM THE BEGINNING,
13	THE NETWORK CREATED SYSTEMS FOR KNOWLEDGE CAPTURE
14	AND DISSEMINATION, AND NETWORK SITES HAVE SPONSORED
15	CONTINUING EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITY TO
16	DEVELOP THE NEXT GENERATION OF DOCTORS, NURSES,
17	RESEARCHERS, AND TECHNICIANS. FOR EXAMPLE, IN
18	AUGUST 2018, CITY OF HOPE, IN COLLABORATION WITH THE
19	ENTIRE NETWORK, HOSTED A TWO-DAY CONTINUING
20	EDUCATION PROGRAM WITH 155 ATTENDEES, 88 OF WHICH
21	WERE REGISTERED NURSES.
22	AND THEN, FINALLY, I WANT TO HIGHLIGHT OUR
23	CELLULAR THERAPY CLINICAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP
24	PROGRAM THAT CAME UP EARLIER IN COMMENT. AND THIS
25	BRIEF VIDEO WILL HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THE SUCCESS OF

1	THIS PROGRAM.
2	(THE VIDEO WAS THEN SHARED, NOT
3	REPORTED NOR HEREIN TRANSCRIBED.)
4	DR. LOMAX: MARIA, DO YOU WANT TO HAND IT
5	BACK TO YOU?
6	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH, GEOFF.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS, I'M HANDING IT BACK TO YOU AT THIS
8	TIME. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS RELATED TO
9	THIS PRESENTATION.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. AND, GEOFF,
11	YOU'VE GOT A GREAT RADIO PERSONALITY VOICE. PERHAPS
12	IN YOUR SPARE TIME YOU CAN DOUBLE IN THAT ARENA AS
13	WELL.
14	DR. LOMAX: FULL DISCLOSURE, AS A UC DAVIS
15	ALUMNI, ACTUALLY ONE OF MY LAST THINGS WAS TO BE THE
16	GENERAL MANAGER OF THE RADIO STATION, SO I
17	APPRECIATE THAT IT'S RUBBED OFF.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THERE YOU GO. THANK YOU
19	FOR THAT PRESENTATION. COMMENTS ON THE ALPHA CLINIC
20	PROGRAM BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
21	
Δ1	DR. DULIEGE: ACTUALLY MOSTLY A QUESTION,
22	DR. DULIEGE: ACTUALLY MOSTLY A QUESTION, GEOFF. I RECALL THAT YOU MANAGE THE CLINICAL TRIALS
22	GEOFF. I RECALL THAT YOU MANAGE THE CLINICAL TRIALS
22	GEOFF. I RECALL THAT YOU MANAGE THE CLINICAL TRIALS IN THE ALPHA CLINIC PROGRAMS. THE CIRM HIRED A CRO.

1	YOU GOING TO EXTEND THEIR CONTRACTS?
2	DR. MILLAN: I'LL TAKE THAT QUESTION, DR.
3	DULIEGE. I THINK WHAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO MAY BE A
4	GRANTEE OF OURS, IQVIA, THAT WAS FUNDED THROUGH THE
5	ACCELERATING CENTER AND TRANSLATING CENTER
6	INFRASTRUCTURE AWARDS, AND THOSE WEREN'T CONTRACTS
7	PER SE. THEY WERE GRANT AWARDS. AND THE
8	ACCELERATING CENTER AWARD, AND JUST BY WAY OF
9	BACKGROUND, THAT ACCELERATING CENTER WAS INTENDED TO
10	PROVIDE SERVICES FOR STEM CELL AND REGENERATIVE
11	MEDICINE CLINICAL TRIALS RELATED TO CLINICAL
12	OPERATIONS, REGULATORY SUPPORT, AND ALL THINGS
13	RELATED TO ACTUALLY RUNNING THE TRIALS. THE
14	TRANSLATING CENTER IS INTENDED TO HELP WITH KIND OF
15	THE PRE-IND OR IND-ENABLING ACTIVITIES, PROCESS
16	DEVELOPMENT, MANUFACTURING, AND PRECLINICAL STUDIES
17	THAT WOULD ENABLE OUR PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE WHAT THEY
18	NEEDED TO GO INTO THE CLINICS.
19	SO BOTH PROGRAMS, THE ACCELERATING CENTER
20	HAS ALREADY COMPLETED AND I THINK IT'S NOW A
21	SELF-SUSTAINING ENTITY IN CALIFORNIA SERVING THE
22	BROADER COMMUNITY AS WELL AS OUR PROGRAMS FOR THE
23	TYPE OF SUPPORT THAT THEY PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED. AND
24	DR. CREASEY GAVE A REVIEW OF THAT PROGRAM AT A
25	PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING LAST YEAR. AND THEN THE

1	TRANSLATING CENTER IS IN ITS FINAL STAGES STILL
2	SUPPORTING OUR PRECLINICAL PROGRAMS AND TRANSLATING
3	THEM TO THE CLINIC. AND ONCE THAT'S FINISHED, THOSE
4	AWARDS ARE COMPLETE. AND THE IDEA WOULD BE, UNLESS
5	THERE IS ANOTHER INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, THE INTENT
6	OF THOSE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES WAS THAT THOSE
7	ENTITIES WOULD BE SET UP AND THAT THEY WOULD BE
8	SELF-SUSTAINABLE AND BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THE SERVICES
9	AND THE ASSETS THAT WERE DEVELOPED BY THE SEED
10	FUNDING FROM CIRM.
11	I THINK IN TERMS OF HOW DID IT WORK OUT,
12	THERE WAS DEFINITELY A LEARNING CURVE FOR THE
13	ACCELERATING CENTER BECAUSE THE FIELD WAS SO NEW,
14	AND THAT'S THE REASON THAT IQVIA, WHICH IS A VERY
15	BIG KIND OF INTERNATIONAL CRO AND DATA COMPANY NOW,
16	REALLY UNDERSTOOD THAT THE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
17	FIELD WAS THE FUTURE. AND SO BY PUTTING A TEAM
18	TOGETHER THAT SPECIFICALLY SUPPORTED THIS EFFORT,
19	FOR SURE THERE WAS A LEARNING CURVE IN HOW THEY WORK
20	WITH ACADEMIC CENTERS, BUT THERE HAVE BEEN QUITE A
21	FEW PROGRAMS THAT WERE SUCCESSFUL KIND OF ONCE THE
22	LEARNING CURVE HAD COMPLETED.
23	THE TRANSLATING CENTER, I'VE GOTTEN A
24	REPORT, HAS CONTINUED TO BE GAINING CONTRACTS TO
25	HELP PEOPLE, OUR GRANTEES AND OTHERS, OVERCOME SOME

1	OF THE TRANSLATIONAL CHALLENGES THEY MAY HAVE TO
2	GETTING TO THE IND.
3	DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU FOR THESE
4	CLARIFICATIONS. I APPRECIATE IT.
5	DR. MILLAN: YOU'RE WELCOME.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER QUESTIONS OR
7	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY. JUST TO
8	FINISH, GEOFF, JUST CONGRATULATIONS. YOU'VE BEEN
9	RUNNING THIS PROGRAM FOR SEVERAL YEARS NOW. IT'S A
10	GREAT SUCCESS AND WILL ONLY CONTINUE TO BE MORE SO.
11	AND WE REALLY APPRECIATE ALL THE TIME AND EFFORT
12	YOU'VE PUT INTO MAKING THIS HAPPEN. SO THANK YOU.
13	DR. LOMAX: THANK YOU.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THE NIFTY CIRM LOGO
15	BEHIND YOU AS WELL. OKAY. MR. MILLAN.
16	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU. GEOFF IS GOING
17	CONTINUE TO BE ON HERE AS OUR SLIDE DRIVER. SO IF
18	THERE AREN'T ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ALPHA CLINICS,
19	THE NEXT PROGRAM WE'D LIKE TO BRING TO YOU ARE
20	EDUCATION PROGRAMS BEING PRESENTED BY DR. KELLY
21	SHEPARD. AS MENTIONED IN MY INTRODUCTORY SLIDE, DR.
22	SHEPARD WILL BE PROVIDING A BACKGROUND ON MAINLY TWO
23	EDUCATION PROGRAMS, THE BRIDGES PROGRAM AND THE
24	TRAINING AWARDS, AND THE SPARK PROGRAM IS ALSO
25	SOMETHING THAT'S GOING TO BE BROUGHT TO YOU SOON.
	100

1	BUT SHE WILL GIVE A BACKGROUND, AND THERE WILL BE
2	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION. AND WE ARE
3	SEEKING BOARD INPUT ON THIS BECAUSE POTENTIALLY WE
4	WOULD BRING THIS BEFORE YOU WITH A CONCEPT AND A
5	POTENTIAL BUDGET AT THE NEXT MEETING.
6	SO, DR. SHEPARD, PLEASE GO AHEAD AND THE
7	FLOOR IS YOURS.
8	DR. SHEPARD: IS EVERYONE ABLE TO HEAR ME?
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
10	DR. SHEPARD: GREAT. MY NAME IS KELLY
11	SHEPARD, AND I'M ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF OUR
12	DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND EDUCATION TEAM. AND
13	I'VE BEEN INVOLVED WITH OUR BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS
14	AS WELL AS AT SOME CAPACITY IN OUR TRAINING GRANT
15	PROGRAM FOR THE PAST 12 YEARS.
16	SO I'D LIKE TO JUST BEGIN BY GIVING A
17	BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORY AND OUTCOMES OF OUR
18	TRADITIONAL TRAINING GRANT PROGRAMS WHICH STARTED,
19	AS JAMES MENTIONED IN HIS PRESENTATION, AS OUR VERY
20	FIRST INITIATIVE, OUR VERY FIRST INITIATIVE AT ALL
21	IN 2005 AND IS CONTINUING TO THIS DAY.
22	SO ON THE LEFT WE HAVE SPARK PROGRAM WHICH
23	SUPPORTS SUMMER RESEARCH INTERNSHIPS FOR HIGH SCHOOL
24	STUDENTS. WE'VE BEEN SUPPORTING THIS FOR ABOUT NINE
25	YEARS NOW. AND THAN THE TWO PROGRAMS THAT ARE GOING
	101

1	TO BE MORE TOPIC OF FOCUSED DISCUSSION IN A FEW
2	MINUTES WHICH ARE OUR BRIDGES AND RESEARCH TRAINING
3	PROGRAMS.
4	THE BRIDGES PROGRAM SUPPORTS UNDERGRADUATE
5	AND MASTER'S LEVEL RESEARCH TRAINING. AND THE
6	RESEARCH TRAINING GRANTS SUPPORT TRAINING AT THE
7	PRE- AND POSTDOCTORAL LEVEL AS WELL AS HAS SUPPORTED
8	THE CLINICAL FELLOW LEVEL. IF I COULD HAVE THE NEXT
9	SLIDE PLEASE.
10	SO LET'S FIRST START WITH A QUICK
11	DISCUSSION OF THE BRIDGES PROGRAM BECAUSE THESE
12	AWARDS, THROUGH THEIR 71 FUNDING, ARE ACTUALLY
13	ENDING IMMINENTLY WITHIN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS AND A
14	FEW OTHERS ARE ENDING IN 2022 AS WELL. OF COURSE,
15	AS WITH CIRM'S TRAINING AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
16	PROGRAMS, THE GOALS OF THESE ARE TO CREATE A DIVERSE
17	AND WELL-TRAINED WORKFORCE OF SCIENTISTS AND
18	TECHNICIANS AT ALL LEVELS TO HELP REALIZE THE FULL
19	POTENTIAL FOR STEM CELLS TO TREAT PATIENTS WITH
20	UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS.
21	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SPECIFICALLY, WE'LL
22	FOCUS FIRST ON THE BRIDGES PROGRAM, THE OBJECTIVE OF
23	WHICH HAS BEEN TO PREPARE CALIFORNIA'S UNDERGRADUATE
24	AND MASTER'S STUDENTS FOR PRODUCTIVE CAREERS IN STEM
25	CELL RESEARCH AND THERAPY DEVELOPMENT. SO THESE

1	PROGRAMS ARE STRUCTURED BY INTEGRATION INTO
2	BACHELOR'S, MASTER'S, OR CERTIFICATE GRANTING
3	PROGRAMS BASED AT HOME INSTITUTIONS AROUND THE STATE
4	OF CALIFORNIA.
5	I WILL GET TO WHAT THOSE HOME INSTITUTIONS
6	ARE ON MY NEXT SLIDE, BUT FIRST I THOUGHT IT WOULD
7	BE WORTH POINTING OUT HOW THIS PROGRAM HAS BEEN
8	FUNDED FOR THESE PAST TWELVE YEARS. THE ORIGINAL
9	BRIDGES GRANT PROGRAMS WERE OFFERED IN 2008 AS A
10	REQUEST FOR FUNDING. THERE WAS A REVIEW AND AWARDS
11	WERE MADE THAT WERE LAUNCHED IN 2009. THESE WERE
12	THREE-YEAR AWARDS, BUT THEY ARE EXTENDED
13	SUBSEQUENTLY BY A BOARD ALLOCATION. AND THEN AT THE
14	END OF THAT EXTENSION, WE WERE IN TRANSITION TO OUR
15	NEW LEADERSHIP UNDER DR. RANDY MILLS. SO OUR BOARD
16	GRANTED A SEVENTH YEAR TO THESE PROGRAMS WHILE WE
17	DEVELOPED A NEW STRATEGIC PLAN UNDER DR. MILLS'
18	LEADERSHIP AND REVAMPED THE PROGRAM FOR A SECOND
19	RFA, ALLOWING AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THESE SUCCESSFUL
20	PROGRAMS TO COME BACK AND REAPPLY FOR A NEW ROUND OF
21	FUNDING WITH SOME MODIFICATIONS TO ALIGN THESE
22	PROGRAMS TO OUR NEW STRATEGIC PLAN.
23	THOSE AWARDS, WHICH ARE THE ONES THAT ARE
24	ACTIVE TODAY BUT ENDING SOON, WERE OFFERED IN 2015,
25	AND THEY WERE FIVE-YEAR AWARDS.

1	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO THESE ARE THE
2	INSTITUTIONS THAT HOST BRIDGES AWARDS. HISTORICALLY
3	THERE WERE 16; PRESENTLY THERE ARE 14. AS YOU CAN
4	SEE, THESE ARE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITIES AND
5	COMMUNITY COLLEGES AROUND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
6	THE POINT YOU SEE FARTHEST UP NORTH IS HUMBOLDT
7	STATE, THE FARTHEST SOUTH IS SAN DIEGO STATE, AND
8	THE EASTERNMOST REPRESENTATION IS SACRAMENTO STATE
9	AND CAL STATE UNIVERSITY SAN BERNARDINO.
10	EACH ONE OF THESE PROGRAMS IS A LITTLE BIT
11	DIFFERENT FROM THE NEXT. AS I MENTIONED, SOME ARE
12	MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAMS, SOME ARE CERTIFICATE, AND
13	SOME ARE TARGETING UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL PROGRAMS.
14	HOWEVER, THEY ALL DO HAVE SOME CORE FEATURES IN
15	COMMON THAT I'D LIKE TO SHARE ON MY NEXT SLIDE
16	PLEASE.
17	SO IN ADDITION TO THE COURSEWORK THAT
18	STUDENTS TAKE AT THEIR HOME UNIVERSITY, THEY ALL
19	TAKE AN ADVANCED LABORATORY TECHNIQUES COURSE THAT
20	WAS OFFERED BY AND IN MANY CASES DEVELOPED BY OUR
21	SHARED LABS GRANTS PROGRAM THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT
22	IN A LITTLE BIT. YOU HEARD ABOUT A LITTLE BIT FROM
23	JAMES, AND YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT AGAIN AFTER MY
24	PRESENTATION. ALL PROGRAMS HAVE REQUIRED ACTIVITIES
25	WHERE STUDENTS INTERACT DIRECTLY WITH PATIENT OR
	104

1	PATIENT ADVOCATES, AND THEY ALSO PARTICIPATE IN
2	COMMUNITY OUTREACH EFFORTS TO HELP THEM BECOME
3	AMBASSADORS FOR THE STEM CELL FIELD AROUND OUR
4	COMMUNITIES.
5	BUT THE CENTRAL DEFINING HALLMARK OF THE
6	BRIDGES PROGRAMS ARE THE FULL-TIME PAID RESEARCH
7	INTERNSHIPS AT PARTNERING OR WHAT WE CALL HOST
8	INSTITUTIONS. THESE HOST INSTITUTIONS ARE MAJOR
9	RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES AROUND THE STATE AS WELL AS
10	BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANIES THAT HAVE A FOCUS IN
11	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. MOST OF THESE PROGRAMS OFFER
12	YEAR-LONG INTERNSHIPS, SOME OF THEM NINE MONTHS OR
13	SO. THIS IS KIND OF THE HALLMARK FEATURE. THE
14	STUDENTS ARE ABLE TO GO AND WORK FULL TIME IN THESE
15	LABS AND ARE SUPPORTED THROUGH THE BRIDGES GRANTS.
16	AT THE END OF THEIR EXPERIENCE, THERE'S A
17	CULMINATING ANNUAL BRIDGES CONFERENCE WHERE THE
18	ALUMNI FROM ALL ACROSS THE STATE ARE ABLE TO COME
19	TOGETHER FOR THAT YEAR AND DISCUSS THEIR RESEARCH
20	WITH ONE ANOTHER AND NETWORK.
21	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO IN THE ELEVEN
22	YEARS, THE FIRST ELEVEN YEARS OF THIS PROGRAM, OVER
23	1500 ALUMNI HAVE RESULTED. A SURVEY OF THOSE ALUMNI
24	OF THOSE WHO RESPONDED INDICATE THAT ABOUT 48
25	PERCENT OF THEM ARE FIRST GENERATION COLLEGE

1	STUDENTS, OVER 60 PERCENT HAVE FOUND EMPLOYMENT
2	AFTER THEIR GRADUATION IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
3	POSITIONS, JUST ABOUT HALF AND HALF IN ACADEMIC
4	RESEARCH LABS VERSUS THE BIOTECH OR PHARMACEUTICAL
5	INDUSTRY. ANOTHER 35 PERCENT OF THESE STUDENTS GO
6	ON TO FURTHER THEIR EDUCATION IN PH.D.,
7	PROFESSIONAL, OR OTHER GRADUATE PROGRAMS, INCLUDING
8	MEDICAL SCHOOL. AND DURING THEIR INTERNSHIPS, OUR
9	BRIDGES ALUMNI HAD CONTRIBUTED THUS FAR TO 261
LO	PUBLICATIONS.
L1	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. I'M JUST BRIEFLY GOING
L2	TO GO OVER THE OUTCOMES OF THE SPARK PROGRAM BECAUSE
L3	WE'RE GOING TO BE BRINGING THIS TO YOU A LITTLE BIT
L4	LATER. BUT THIS IS OUR HIGH SCHOOL RESEARCH
L5	INTERNSHIP PROGRAM, AND THUS FAR 482 HIGH SCHOOL
L6	STUDENTS HAVE COMPLETED THEIR INTERNSHIPS SINCE 2012
L7	WHEN WE BEGAN OFFERING THIS PROGRAM. AND A SURVEY
L8	OF SOME ALUMNI OF THIS PROGRAM INDICATED THE
L9	MAJORITY OF THEM HAVE CONTINUED TO PURSUE BIOLOGY OR
20	OTHER STEM-RELATED FIELDS, AND MANY OF THEM ARE
21	ATTENDING UC'S OR OTHER UNIVERSITIES AROUND
22	CALIFORNIA, AND ABOUT A THIRD OF THEM ARE ATTENDING
23	SCHOOLS OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA.
24	MY NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. THE THIRD PROGRAM
25	I'M GOING TO TELL YOU ABOUT IS NOT CURRENTLY ACTIVE,

1	BUT WE THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER BRINGING A
2	CONCEPT TO YOU TO ADAPT THIS TO OUR TIMES. THIS IS
3	THE RESEARCH TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM. IT WAS ACTIVE
4	FROM 2006 THROUGH 2016. THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS
5	PROGRAM WAS TO CREATE A DIVERSE CADRE OF SCIENTISTS
6	WITH KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL TO LEAD EFFECTIVE STEM CELL
7	RESEARCH PROGRAMS; IN OTHER WORDS, FUTURE FACULTY
8	AND PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS. THESE WERE REFERRED TO
9	AS THE CIRM SCHOLARS, AND THE TRAINING TARGETED
10	STUDENTS WHO WERE PRE-PH.D. AS WELL AS POSTDOCTORAL
11	FELLOWS AND CLINICAL FELLOWS.
12	THE WAY THESE PROGRAMS WERE STRUCTURED IS
13	THAT EACH INSTITUTION OFFERED A SINGLE INTEGRATED
14	PROGRAM OF TRAINING THAT WAS REALLY DESIGNED TO BE
15	APPROPRIATE FOR THE LEVEL OF THE TRAINEE THAT THEY
16	WERE TARGETING AS WELL ITS OWN EXPERTISE OF ITS OWN
17	FACULTY.
18	THESE GRANTS WERE SUPPORTED BY TWO RFA'S.
19	THE FIRST WAS OFFERED IN 2005, AS JAMES HIGHLIGHTED.
20	THESE WERE THE T SERIES GRANTS, AND THEY WERE ACTIVE
21	FOR THREE YEARS. THE PROGRAM WAS THEN RELAUNCHED AS
22	THE RESEARCH TRAINING 2 AWARDS IN 2009. THOSE AGAIN
23	WERE THREE-YEAR AWARDS, BUT THEY WERE EXTENDED BY A
24	BOARD ALLOCATION FOR AN ADDITIONAL THREE YEARS. SO
25	THAT RFA WAS LAST OFFERED IN 2008.

1	MY NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. AND THE RESEARCH
2	TRAINING GRANTS, THIS IS THE LIST OF WHERE THEY TOOK
3	PLACE. AS YOU CAN SEE, THERE'S A VARIETY OF
4	INSTITUTIONS, SOME WITH MEDICAL SCHOOLS, SOME
5	SMALLER INSTITUTIONS THAT MAINLY FOCUSED ON
6	POST-DOCTORAL FELLOW OR GRADUATE STUDENTS. AND IN
7	THE END, THE ALUMNI FROM THESE PROGRAMS, THE CIRM
8	SCHOLARS, THERE ARE 940 OF THEM, THEY'VE CONTRIBUTED
9	TO OVER A THOUSAND PUBLICATIONS IN THE SCIENTIFIC
10	LITERATURE. AND YOU HEARD WITH REFERENCE TO DR.
11	ROSSI EARLIER, THERE ARE MULTIPLE EXAMPLES OF
12	GRADUATES OF THIS PROGRAM WHO HAVE GONE ON TO BECOME
13	FACULTY LEADERS INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA AND
14	HAVE EVEN COME BACK AND RECEIVED ADDITIONAL CIRM
15	FUNDING FOR THEIR OWN RESEARCH PROGRAMS IN THEIR OWN
16	LABORATORIES.
17	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO THAT CONCLUDED MY
18	TOUR OF THE HISTORY OF CIRM'S LEGACY TRAINING
19	PROGRAMS, AND NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN A
20	DISCUSSION OF HOW WE MIGHT ADAPT THESE PROGRAMS TO
21	SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE PRESENT AND FUTURE IN
22	PROPOSITION 14.
23	WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS FIRST FOCUS ON
24	BRIDGES BECAUSE THOSE PROGRAMS ARE ENDING
25	IMMINENTLY. I WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT A FEW POINTS TO

108

1	KIND OF TEE UP YOUR DISCUSSION, AND THEN CHAIRMAN
2	J.T. OR DR. MILLAN MAY MODERATE OR ENGAGE YOU IN A
3	DISCUSSION. AND YOU COULD COME BACK TO ME IF THERE
4	ARE QUESTIONS, OF COURSE. AND THEN ONCE YOU'RE
5	SATISFIED WITH THAT DISCUSSION, WE CAN MOVE ON AND
6	DO THE SAME EXERCISE FOR THE TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.
7	SO TO MITIGATE THE LOSS OF CONTINUITY FOR
8	THESE SUCCESSFUL PIPELINE PROGRAMS, WE'RE PROPOSING
9	TO RELAUNCH BRIDGES AND LATER SPARK WITH
10	IMPROVEMENTS THAT WILL OPTIMALLY ALIGN THE PROGRAMS
11	WITH TODAY'S SCIENTIFIC AND WORKFORCE NEEDS AND
12	PROPOSITION 14 OBJECTIVES. SO WE'RE SEEKING YOUR
13	BOARD INPUT TO INFORM A REVISED CONCEPT AS FOLLOWS.
14	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. GIVEN THE FACT THAT
15	THIS PROGRAM HAS BEEN VERY WIDELY RECOGNIZED AS
16	SUCCESSFUL AND IMPACTFUL, WE WOULD PROPOSE RETAINING
17	THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS IN A NEW CONCEPT: OF
18	COURSE, THE HANDS-ON RESEARCH INTERNSHIPS IN WORLD
19	CLASS RESEARCH LABORATORIES AND BIOTECHNOLOGY
20	COMPANIES, THE ADVANCED CULTURE STEM CELL TECHNIQUES
21	TRAINING COURSE THAT PREPARES THESE STUDENTS TO HIT
22	THE GROUND RUNNING WHEN THEY START THEIR RESEARCH
23	INTERNSHIPS, CONTINUED SUPPORT OF RECRUITMENT
24	STRATEGIES TO BROADEN THE PARTICIPATION OF
25	UNDERREPRESENTED POPULATIONS AMONGST THE TRAINEES,
	100

1	CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN THE PATIENT ENGAGEMENT
2	AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES THAT WE THINK
3	HELPS PREPARE THEM TO BE ADVOCATES FOR OUR FIELD AND
4	THEIR COMMUNITIES, A REGULATORY COURSE AND CAREER
5	COUNSELING, AND, FINALLY, THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE TO
6	ALLOW THEM TO SHARE THEIR RESEARCH WITH ONE ANOTHER
7	AND NETWORK WITH THEIR PEERS.
8	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. NOW SOME POSSIBLE
9	IMPROVEMENTS AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS YOU MIGHT WANT
10	TO CONSIDER: BROADENING THE TYPES OF ALLOWABLE
11	RESEARCH ACTIVITIES THAT THE TRAINEES ARE ABLE TO DO
12	IN THEIR INTERNSHIPS. THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH SOME
13	OF THE DISCUSSION YOU HAD WITH JAMES AROUND CHANGES
14	IN PROP 14. UPDATING THE AWARD AMOUNTS REFLECTS THE
15	CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION. AS YOU SAW FROM MY
16	PREVIOUS SLIDE, SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS WERE
17	ORIGINALLY ISSUED THROUGH RFA'S THAT ARE QUITE OLD
18	NOW, AND THE COSTS OF LIVING TODAY HAVE INCREASED A
19	LITTLE BIT. ADDING MORE DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
20	INCLUSION PLANS TO BRING THESE IN LINE WITH THE
21	CHANGES WE'VE INTRODUCED IN OUR OTHER PIPELINE
22	PROGRAMS. AND THEN ONE THING TO POSSIBLY CONSIDER
23	IS HOW WE WOULD KEEP THESE PROGRAMS RUNNING IN THE
24	LONGER TERM.
25	SO AS I'VE DISCUSSED, WE'VE HAD EXPERIENCE
	110

1	WITH OFFERING PERIODIC RFA'S AND BOARD APPROVED
2	EXTENSIONS. WE'VE HAD EXPERIENCE WITH RUNNING THESE
3	AWARDS FOR THREE-YEAR TERMS OR FIVE-YEAR TERMS. SO
4	THESE ARE THINGS THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT
5	OR MAY WANT TO CONSIDER FURTHER.
6	AND THEN, FINALLY, INCREASING THE REACH OF
7	THE PROGRAM. PRESENTLY WE DO SUPPORT 14 OF THESE
8	PROGRAMS, AND I SHOWED YOU A MAP OF WHERE THEY FALL.
9	IS THIS A SIZE OF PROGRAM THAT YOU'RE COMFORTABLE
10	WITH MOVING FORWARD, OR COULD THERE BE
11	CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT EXPANDING THE TOTAL NUMBER OF
12	PROGRAMS, ALLOWING PEOPLE TO COME IN AND DEVELOP NEW
13	BRIDGES PROGRAMS WITH AN EYE TOWARDS INCREASING
14	ACCESS TO STUDENTS IN DIVERSE PARTS OF THE STATE IN
15	DIVERSE COMMUNITIES?
16	SO THOSE ARE THE POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION
17	THAT WE HAD CONSIDERED INTERNALLY. AND NOW IF MR.
18	CHAIRMAN OR DR. MILLAN OR WHOEVER WOULD LIKE TO TAKE
19	THIS PART, AND THEN WE CAN COME BACK TO ME FOR THE
20	SECOND PART LATER.
21	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, KELLY. THE CIRM
22	TEAM WOULD LIKE BRING THIS TO THE BOARD IN FEBRUARY.
23	SO WE'RE TAKING ALL THESE THINGS INTO CONSIDERATION,
24	THE ELEMENTS THAT KELLY HAD PRESENTED. WE REALLY
25	WELCOME FEEDBACK AND YOUR SENSE OF WHETHER THIS IS

1	READY TO COME BACK TO YOU IN FEBRUARY WITH A
2	PROPOSED BUDGET.
3	THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND NOW I'LL TURN IT
4	OVER TO CHAIRMAN THOMAS FOR THE DISCUSSION.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. JUST AS AN
6	OVERVIEW COMMENT, BOTH OF THESE PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN
7	TREMENDOUS SUCCESSES SINCE INCEPTION. AND ONE OF
8	THE GREAT JOYS OF WORKING WITH CIRM IS TO GET TO GO
9	TO THESE END-OF-YEAR EVENTS THAT DR. SHEPARD
10	REFERENCED WHERE YOU GET A REAL FEEL FOR EXACTLY
11	WHAT HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN THE PROGRAMS AND THE
12	AMOUNT OF LEARNING THAT THE STUDENTS HAVE HAD. IT'S
13	MOST IMPRESSIVE. AND I'M A VERY, VERY STRONG
14	ADVOCATE OF BOTH OF THESE.
15	SHOUT OUT HERE GOES TO SENATOR TORRES FOR
16	HIS INSTRUMENTAL ROLE IN THE PROGRAMS GOING BACK
17	MANY YEARS AND SORT OF HELPING TO DRIVE THEM TO MAKE
18	THEM HAPPEN.
19	SO, LASTLY, BEFORE WE GET TO OTHER
20	COMMENT, TO DR. SHEPARD AS WITH MR. LOMAX, THANK YOU
21	FOR YOUR GREAT WORK IN RUNNING THESE PROGRAMS.
22	THERE'S A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF WORK THAT'S INVOLVED,
23	WHETHER IT'S IN NORMAL YEARS OR VIRTUAL YEARS SUCH
24	AS WE'VE JUST HAD. SO YOU'VE REALLY DONE WONDERFUL
25	WORK HERE, AND THE PROOF IS IN THE PUDDING IN THE
	112

1	STATS THAT DR. SHEPARD REFERENCED AND ALL OF THE
2	GREAT WORK THAT THESE STUDENTS HAVE DONE. SO WITH
3	THAT, WANTED TO OPEN IT UP TO BOARD COMMENT.
4	MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE ARE MY
5	BABIES, BRIDGES AND SPARKS. AND WHEN I FIRST CAME
6	ON BOARD IN 2009, BOB HAD HELPED CREATE THE BRIDGES
7	PROGRAM, AND I WAS IMMEDIATELY ATTRACTED TO IT
8	BECAUSE IT WAS PART OF THE WORK THAT I DID IN THE
9	LEGISLATURE WAS HOW DO WE REACH OUT TO CREATE MORE
10	DIVERSITY IN OUR FUTURE EDUCATIONAL LEADERS. AND
11	CLEARLY THIS WAS A PERFECT OPPORTUNITY TO HELP DO
12	THAT.
13	WHEN I STARTED TALKING TO MEMBERS OF THE
14	LEGISLATURE BACK IN '09 AND THEN TREASURER JOHN
15	CHAING, THEY BECAME TOTAL ADVOCATES FOR US IN
16	RESPECT TO THIS PARTICULAR ELEMENT, THAT WE WERE
17	HELPING TO CREATE FUTURE SCIENTISTS IN RESEARCH THAT
18	WAS SO NEEDED FOR CALIFORNIANS.
19	AND THEN I CREATED THE SPARKS PROGRAM
20	BECAUSE I SAID, HERE, WE HAVE A BRIDGES PROGRAM.
21	WHY DON'T WE LOOK AT THE HIGH SCHOOLS AND SEE WHAT'S
22	OUT THERE. SO MONTY, WHO WAS FORMERLY ON OUR STAFF,
23	REALLY HELPED ME DO THAT. AND, KELLY, I JUST WANT
24	TO THANK YOU AND GEOFF FOR TAKING ON THIS
25	RESPONSIBILITY BECAUSE THE STUDENTS ARE JUST
	112

1	OVERWHELMINGLY ENTHUSIASTIC AT OUR SPARKS MEETINGS
2	AND BRIDGES PROGRAMS.
3	AND NOW AS A UC REGENT, IN SHARING THESE
4	PROGRAMS WITH MY FELLOW REGENTS, THEY'RE ASTONISHED
5	AT WHAT WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO ACHIEVE. THEY HAD HEARD
6	OF CIRM, FOR EXAMPLE, IN TERMS OF THE RESEARCH
7	BECAUSE THEY WERE THE BENEFICIARIES OF SO MUCH OF
8	OUR GENEROSITY, BUT THEY DIDN'T REALIZE WHAT WE WERE
9	ALSO DOING FOR STUDENTS AND HOW WE'VE EXPANDED,
10	ESPECIALLY WITH MY FRIEND, WHO'S NOW THE NEW
11	CHANCELLOR AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM,
12	AND CLEARLY WITH OUR NEW PRESIDENT WHO IS AN
13	OPHTHALMOLOGY PROFESSOR AND DOCTOR, DR MICHAEL
14	DRAKE, WHO STUDIED AT CSF, THEY RECOGNIZE THE
15	TREMENDOUS IMPACT THAT THIS IS GOING TO HAVE ON OUR
16	SOCIETY.
17	AND LASTLY, THE CONVERSATIONS THAT WE ARE
18	NOW HAVING WITH MY OLD INSTITUTION, UC SANTA CRUZ,
19	AND MARIA AND I HAVE AND OTHERS ABOUT DEVELOPMENT OF
20	THE PH.D. PROGRAMS AND CANDIDATES IN THE SCHOLARS
21	PROGRAM. THIS IS ALL AN INTEGRAL PART OF LAYING THE
22	FOUNDATION FOR THE FUTURE. SO I'M JUST SO GRATEFUL
23	FOR THE STAFF AND MARIA AND OTHERS THAT HAVE WORKED
24	ON THIS, AND THE CHANCELLORS WHO HAVE BEEN REALLY
25	SUPPORTIVE, SAM HAWGOOD, CINDY LARIVE FROM UC SANTA
	114

1	CRUZ, AS WELL AS OUR PRESIDENT DRAKE FROM THE
2	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA. SO THANK YOU AGAIN, KELLY
3	AND GEOFF, AND THANK YOU AGAIN FOR THIS LEADERSHIP
4	BECAUSE IT IS SO NEEDED AND SO WELL RESPECTED.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, SENATOR
6	TORRES. OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
7	DR. DEAS: YES. I'D LIKE TO JUST ECHO
8	ART'S COMMENTS, THAT THIS IS A TREMENDOUS PROGRAM,
9	BOTH BRIDGES AND SPARK. I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO
10	MEET SOME OF THE PARTICIPANTS FROM CAL STATE SAN
11	BERNARDINO. AND I WAS JUST REALLY IMPRESSED WITH
12	THE CANDIDATES OR THE PARTICIPANTS IN THAT PROGRAM
13	AND THE RESEARCH THAT THEY HAD ENGAGED IN THROUGHOUT
14	THEIR TRAINING.
15	I'M VERY MUCH AN ADVOCATE FOR US EXPANDING
16	THE REACH OF THIS PROGRAM. I KNOW WE HAVE SOME AS
17	WAS PRESENTED ABOUT 18 PROGRAMS ALREADY. AND WITH
18	EXPANSION OF THE REACH, ESPECIALLY GIVEN THAT WE ARE
19	ALLOCATING AT LEAST 1.5 BILLION INTO THE
20	NEUROSCIENCE AREA, I'M JUST THINKING THAT, THROUGH
21	THE EXPANSION OF THE REACH, THERE MAY BE PROGRAMS
22	THAT MAY COME ON BOARD WITH OTHER RESEARCH TRAINING
23	AND ACTIVITIES IN VARIOUS AREAS, ESPECIALLY THOSE
24	AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
25	WHAT WE WILL BE FOCUSING ON IN CIRM FOR THE FUTURE.
	115

1	I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO SEE US CONSIDER
2	FUNDING THESE PROGRAMS FOR A LONGER PERIOD THAN
3	THREE YEARS. A LOT OF EFFORTS GO INTO IT. AND JUST
4	WHEN THESE PROGRAMS ARE REACHING THEIR MOMENTUM,
5	THEIR STRIDE, ITS FUNDING IS RUNNING OUT. SO TO THE
6	EXTENT THAT WE CAN DO THAT, I THINK THAT WOULD BE
7	REALLY GREAT.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. BRASHEAR, I BELIEVE
9	YOU HAVE A COMMENT.
10	DR. BRASHEAR: SO I THINK THESE ARE REALLY
11	INSPIRING PROGRAMS. AND AS WE WORK TOWARDS PATHWAY
12	PROGRAMS AND DIVERSIFYING THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND
13	FUTURE SCIENTISTS IN THIS AREA, I WONDER IF WE HAVE
14	OUTCOME MEASURES FOR THE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE BEEN
15	IN THESE DIFFERENT PROGRAMS AND WHAT THEY'RE DOING
16	NOW AND WHAT THEIR FUNDING IS. IF NOT, I THINK THAT
17	WOULD BE A NICE PART TO ADD TO THE STORY.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. SHEPARD, COULD YOU
19	ADDRESS THAT POINT PLEASE?
20	DR. SHEPARD: YES. WE DO HAVE OUTCOME
21	MEASURES, AND AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE, IF THE
22	BOARD IS INTERESTED IN HAVING A LITTLE BIT MORE
23	DETAILED PRESENTATION ON THAT, THE PROGRAMS ARE
24	TRACKING THEIR ALUMNI. AND EVERY YEAR WHEN THEY
25	SUBMIT THEIR PROGRESS REPORTS, THEY GIVE US UPDATES.
	116

1	SO WHILE WE DON'T HAVE THAT INFORMATION FOR
2	EVERYBODY, WE DO HAVE QUITE A LOT OF INFORMATION ON
3	PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN IN THE PROGRAM FOR THE PAST TEN
4	TO ELEVEN YEARS OR SO. I CAN TELL YOU THAT WE KNOW
5	ABOUT SOME OF THE EARLIEST BRIDGES GRADUATES HAVE
6	ALREADY COMPLETED PH.D.'S IN STEM CELL RESEARCH.
7	AND WE ALSO ARE AWARE OF SEVERAL AND THEIR
8	PLACES OF EMPLOYMENT. SO CERTAINLY CAN PROVIDE MORE
9	OF THOSE KIND OF DETAILS WHENEVER THE BOARD IS
10	INTERESTED IN HEARING ABOUT THAT.
11	DR. BRASHEAR: IT WOULD ALSO BE GOOD TO
12	KNOW, FOR EXAMPLE, THE NUMBER OF WOMEN AND OTHER
13	KIND OF PARTS OF THE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE BEEN
14	THROUGH THAT. WE ARE TRYING TO GET A MORE DIVERSE
15	PIPELINE INTO THIS AREA.
16	DR. PRIETO: I JUST WANTED TO THANK DR.
17	SHEPARD ALSO FOR THIS PRESENTATION AND SAY THAT THIS
18	IS ONE OF THE THINGS I'M MOST PROUD OF THAT WE'VE
19	DONE DURING MY TENURE AT CIRM. THIS IS REALLY AN
20	INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE THAT'S GOING TO BEAR FRUIT
21	LONG PAST OUR LIFETIMES. AND I THINK WE COULDN'T DO
22	ANYTHING BETTER THAN THIS.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE. HERE. OTHER
24	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
25	DR. DULIEGE: BRIEFLY, ART, I WANTED TO

1	CONGRATULATE YOU FOR YOUR VISION, YOU AND THE OTHERS
2	WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE FIRST INITIATION, THE
3	FIRST STEPS OF THE BRIDGES/SPARK PROGRAM. AND,
4	KELLY, GREAT PRESENTATION. I'M SURE WE'LL ALL BE
5	SUPPORTIVE OF THAT EFFORT.
6	YOU KNOW, FURTHER TO WHAT ALLISON SAID, I
7	KNOW IN THE FUTURE WE'D LOVE TO SEE A REPORT OF THE
8	DIVERSITY. I WAS GLAD TO SEE THAT A LARGE
9	PROPORTION OF THOSE WHO HAVE BENEFITED FROM THIS
10	PROGRAM ARE FIRST-TIME COLLEGE GRADUATES IN THEIR
11	FAMILIES, WHICH IS REMARKABLE. DO YOU HAVE A SENSE
12	OF OTHER INDICATIONS OF SOCIAL DIVERSITY, WHICH IS
13	SUCH A PART OF OUR FOCUS, MINORITIES, RACIAL
14	MINORITIES, ET CETERA?
15	DR. MILLAN: DR. DULIEGE, IF I MAY RESPOND
16	TO THAT, CHAIRMAN THOMAS?
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SURE.
18	DR. MILLAN: SO, DR. BRASHEAR, IN GENERAL
19	TERMS WE HAVE LOOKED AT, BECAUSE WE HAVE A LIMITED
20	AMOUNT AND WE EXPECT THAT THAT WILL INCREASE WITH
21	DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION KIND OF, AS YOU SAY,
22	HARDWIRED INTO OUR SYSTEMS ARE GOING TO INCREASE THE
23	TYPES OF MEASURES WE TRACK. BUT IN TERMS OF
24	MALE/FEMALE RATIOS, WE DID LOOK AT THIS AND IT'S
25	APPROXIMATELY EQUAL. KELLY CAN CORRECT ME.
	110

1	IN TERMS OF THE DIVERSITY, WE HAVE SOME
2	INDICATION OF THAT, BUT IT'S NOT AS COMPLETE AN
3	INFORMATION. WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING, OR NOT
4	PROPOSING, BUT PLANNING FOR IN TERMS OF GOING
5	FORWARD WITH OUR OPERATIONS IS GAINING A MORE
6	COMPLETE CAPTURE OF THE DEMOGRAPHICS AND ALL THE
7	APPROPRIATE MEASURES SO THAT WE CAN CONTINUE TO SEE
8	HOW WE DO VERSUS HOW WE DESIGNED THE PROGRAMS.
9	AND THEN IN THE MEANWHILE, MARIA
10	BONNEVILLE HAS BEEN REALLY GREAT ABOUT MAKING SURE
11	WHEN BOARD MEMBERS HAVE AREAS OF SPECIFIC INTEREST,
12	THAT WE CAN BRING OUR TEAM TO DO A DEEPER DIVE ON
13	SOME OF THESE TOPICS. SO WE WELCOME THE OPPORTUNITY
14	TO DO THAT AS WELL.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS?
16	DR. SANDMEYER: I THINK I'VE JUST GONE
17	BLIND FROM TRYING TO READ JAMES' CHART. I CAN'T
18	FIND WHERE THE EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE ON THE MONEY
19	CHART. COULD SOMEBODY JUST CLUE ME IN?
20	MR. HARRISON: DR. SANDMEYER, THE
21	EDUCATION PROGRAMS FALL WITHIN THE RESEARCH FUNDING
22	CATEGORY.
23	DR. SANDMEYER: GREAT. THANK YOU.
24	MR. HARRISON: IT WOULD COME OUT OF THE
25	4.7 BILLION.

1	DR. SANDMEYER: GOT IT. THANK YOU.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FURTHER COMMENTS? DR.
3	SHEPARD, PLEASE PROCEED.
4	DR. SHEPARD: COULD I HAVE MY NEXT SLIDE
5	PLEASE. SO NOW WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A SIMILAR
6	CONVERSATION ABOUT OUR RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAMS.
7	NOW, AS I MENTIONED, THIS PROGRAM HAS NOT BEEN
8	ACTIVE. IT ACTUALLY ENDED BACK IN 2016 OR SO. SO
9	IT HASN'T HAD A CHANCE TO BE REVISED THROUGH OUR 2.0
10	EDITION AS THE BRIDGES AND SPARK AWARDS WERE. SOME
11	OF THE IDEAS I'M PRESENTING TO YOU TODAY ARE TO HELP
12	KIND OF BRING IT IN LINE WITH OUR OTHER TRAINING
13	PROGRAMS, BUT ALSO SOME CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT HOW WE
14	MIGHT MAKE THIS PROGRAM MORE EFFECTIVE GOING
15	FORWARD.
16	SO AS WE ALL KNOW, A GROWING DEMAND FOR
17	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE SOLUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA, AS
18	WELL AS EMERGENCE OF POWERFUL NEW TECHNOLOGIES AS
19	THIS FIELD BEGINS TO MATURE AND AN INCREASED
20	AWARENESS OF THE SOCIETAL DISPARITY THAT WE'VE JUST
21	BEEN DISCUSSING, MERIT THE RELAUNCH OF A RESEARCH
22	TRAINING PROGRAM FOR CREATING A PIPELINE OF FUTURE
23	RESEARCH LEADERS; IN OTHER WORDS, TARGETING
24	PREDOCTORAL, POSTDOCTORAL, AND M.D. LEVEL
25	SCIENTISTS.

1	IN ADDITION, COVID-19 HAS HAD AN EXTREMELY
2	DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON RESEARCHERS AND TRAINING AT
3	ALL LEVELS OF THEIR CAREER TRAJECTORY, AND THIS IS
4	EVEN MORE NOTICEABLE IN THOSE TRAINEES WHO ARE
5	LOOKING FOR THEIR NEXT JOB AS SOON AS THEIR TRAINING
6	IS COMPLETE.
7	SO WE BELIEVE CIRM COULD ADDRESS THESE
8	CHALLENGES BY ADAPTING AND MODERNIZING THE FRAMEWORK
9	THAT WE HAD ESTABLISHED THROUGH OUR RESEARCH
10	TRAINING PROGRAM MODEL, AND WE ARE SEEKING YOUR
11	BOARD DISCUSSION AND INPUT TO INFORM A REVISED
12	RESEARCH TRAINING CONCEPT AS FOLLOWS. NEXT SLIDE
13	PLEASE.
14	SO GIVEN THE SUCCESS AND IMPACT OF THE
	PREVIOUS CIRM SCHOLARS PROGRAM, WE WOULD PROPOSE
15	,
15 16	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL,
	, and the second se
16	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL,
16 17	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED
16 17 18	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM THAT DRAWS ON THE EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTEE
16 17 18 19	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM THAT DRAWS ON THE EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTEE FACULTY, ITS OWN FACULTY, AND IS APPROPRIATE TO THE
16 17 18 19 20	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM THAT DRAWS ON THE EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTEE FACULTY, ITS OWN FACULTY, AND IS APPROPRIATE TO THE TARGETED LEVEL OF TRAINING; DELIVERY OF WHATEVER OF
16 17 18 19 20	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM THAT DRAWS ON THE EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTEE FACULTY, ITS OWN FACULTY, AND IS APPROPRIATE TO THE TARGETED LEVEL OF TRAINING; DELIVERY OF WHATEVER OF THEIR APPROPRIATE COURSEWORK AND PROGRAM
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM THAT DRAWS ON THE EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTEE FACULTY, ITS OWN FACULTY, AND IS APPROPRIATE TO THE TARGETED LEVEL OF TRAINING; DELIVERY OF WHATEVER OF THEIR APPROPRIATE COURSEWORK AND PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS THAT THEY'VE DEVELOPED TO SUPPORT THE
16 17 18 19 20 21	RETAINING THESE SUCCESSFUL ELEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, THE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM THAT DRAWS ON THE EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTEE FACULTY, ITS OWN FACULTY, AND IS APPROPRIATE TO THE TARGETED LEVEL OF TRAINING; DELIVERY OF WHATEVER OF THEIR APPROPRIATE COURSEWORK AND PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS THAT THEY'VE DEVELOPED TO SUPPORT THE TRAINEES; STIPENDS TO SUPPORT SUSTAINED, MENTORED

1	CONTINUING TO PROMOTE EFFORTS TO BROADEN THE
2	PARTICIPATION OF UNDERREPRESENTED POPULATIONS
3	AMONGST THE TRAINEES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
4	NOW, BECAUSE WE'RE COMING FROM AN OLDER
5	PROGRAM, I ACTUALLY HAVE TWO SLIDES TO GO THROUGH.
6	THE FIRST IS WHAT INTERNALLY WE WOULD PROPOSE AS PER
7	IMPROVEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE PROGRAM. SO TO
8	BRING THIS IN LINE WITH WHAT I'VE DESCRIBED FOR
9	BRIDGES AND SPARK, WE WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE ADDING
10	SOME ACTIVITIES WHERE TRAINEES HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY
11	TO INTERACT DIRECTLY WITH PATIENTS AS WELL AS
12	COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES TO HELP THEM GAIN
13	SENSITIVITY AND AWARENESS OF DIFFERENCES AND
14	DISPARITIES AMONGST OUR COMMUNITIES AND TO HELP
15	EDUCATE AND CREATE STEM CELL ADVOCATES, ADDING THE
16	DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION PLANS THAT WE'VE
17	ALREADY DISCUSSED.
18	WE MIGHT ENCOURAGE A SPECIALTY COURSE
19	REQUIREMENT THAT'S RELATED TO REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
20	TO COMPLEMENT THE TRAINEES' EXISTING EXPERTISE. FOR
21	EXAMPLE, SINCE THESE ARE POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS IN
22	MANY CASES, THEY ALREADY MAY HAVE AN EXPERTISE IN A
23	SPECIFIC FIELD, STEM CELL BIOLOGY, BIOINFORMATICS,
24	ET CETERA. IT MAY BE NICE OR A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE
25	THEM TAKE AN ADDITIONAL COURSE TO KIND OF COMPLEMENT

1	THEM, PERHAPS IN DATA SCIENCE OR SOMETHING ELSE THAT
2	THE TRAINING PROGRAM MIGHT FEEL IMPORTANT TO CREATE
3	THAT CIRM TRAINING EXPERIENCE IN THEIR OWN PROGRAMS.
4	WE COULD ESTABLISH GUIDELINES FOR THE
5	APPOINTMENT DURATION. IN OUR PREVIOUS PROGRAM,
6	THERE WERE APPOINTMENT PERIODS. THIS IS WHEN THE
7	TRAINEES ARE IN THE LAB DOING THEIR MENTORED
8	RESEARCH OF MINIMALLY 12 MONTHS, BUT WE COULD TRIPLE
9	THOSE GUIDELINES TO ENSURE THAT PREDOCTORAL STUDENTS
10	RECEIVE SUPPORT FOR 36 MONTHS, FOR EXAMPLE. THAT'S
11	MOST APPROPRIATE. OR POSTDOCTORAL AND THE M.D.
12	STAGE FOR 24 MONTHS, ET CETERA.
13	WE WOULD PROPOSE HAVING M.D.'S INCLUDED IN
14	THIS PROGRAM, M.D.'S AT ANY LEVEL WITHIN THE
15	POST-DOC CATEGORY. PREVIOUSLY IT WAS TARGETED AT
16	CLINICAL FELLOWS, WHICH ARE AT THE RESIDENCY STAGE,
17	BUT WE'D LIKE TO OPEN IT UP MORE BROADLY TO ANYONE
18	WITH AN M.D. TO BE IN THESE PROGRAMS.
19	AND THEN, AGAIN, THIS RFA WAS LAST OFFERED
20	IN 2009, SO WE WOULD NEED TO RECALIBRATE THE AWARD
21	BUDGETS TO BETTER REFLECT THE PRESENT COST OF
22	OPERATIONS. MY LAST SLIDE PLEASE.
23	NOW, OTHER THINGS THAT ARE PROBABLY
24	IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER IN THIS RELAUNCH IS THE
25	TIMING. WE'RE STARTING FROM SCRATCH, WELL, NOT

1	SCRATCH, WE'RE STARTING FROM MODIFYING A PREVIOUS
2	CONCEPT. BUT WHEN IS THE IDEAL TIME TO OFFER THIS
3	RFA, THE URGENCY AND TIMING AND THE POTENTIAL TO
4	COUNTERACT COVID 19 HARDSHIPS FACED BY INSTITUTIONS?
5	AND THEN ANOTHER THING THAT YOU MAY BE
6	INTERESTED IN DISCUSSING IS RELATED TO THE TIMING.
7	WHAT IS THE DESIRED SCALE OF THE PROGRAM FOR THE
8	PRESENT NEEDS AS WELL AS MAYBE CONSIDERATIONS OF THE
9	FUTURE NEEDS. BY SCALE OF PROGRAM, I'M REFERRING TO
10	THE NUMBER OF GRANTS TO BE AWARDED, THE SIZE OF THE
11	AWARDS, THE DURATIONS OF THE AWARDS.
12	SO OUR PREVIOUS PROGRAM SUPPORTED 17 OR 18
13	GRANTS, AND THESE GRANTS WERE ALL OF DIFFERENT AWARD
14	SIZES. THERE WERE LARGE GRANTS THAT SUPPORTED UP TO
15	15 TRAINEES A YEAR, AND THERE WERE SMALLER PROGRAMS
16	THAT WERE ABLE TO SUPPORT UP TO FIVE TRAINEES A
17	YEAR. AND THERE ARE ACTUALLY MANY MORE INSTITUTIONS
18	AROUND THE STATE THAN THESE 17 OR 18 THAT COULD
19	THEORETICALLY DEVELOP AND APPLY FOR A NEW TRAINING
20	GRANT PROGRAM. SO IT COULD GET LARGE, OR IT COULD
21	BE A TARGETED SIZE, AND IT DEPENDS ON HOW THE BOARD
22	WOULD LIKE TO SEE THIS DEVELOP.
23	ONE WAY OF CONSTRUCTING THESE AWARDS IS TO
24	OFFER A FIXED AWARD AMOUNT TO EACH PROGRAM, WHICH
25	COULD ALLOW MAXIMUM LEEWAY WITHIN THOSE PROGRAMS FOR

1	THE NUMBER OF TRAINEES THEY APPOINT DEPENDING ON
2	STRENGTH AND NEEDS OF THEIR OWN INSTITUTION. SO
3	THAT'S SOMETHING TO CONSIDER AS WELL AS WHAT WOULD
4	BE THE IDEAL DURATION. THIS IS SIMILAR TO WHAT YOU
5	JUST DISCUSSED ABOUT THE BRIDGES PROGRAM. GIVEN THE
6	BOUNDS BETWEEN SUSTAINING AN INFRASTRUCTURE LONG
7	TERM VERSUS GIVING NEW INSTITUTIONS AN OPPORTUNITY
8	TO APPLY OR EXISTING PROGRAMS TO PROPOSE
9	MODIFICATIONS OVER TIME IF A SIGNIFICANT ENOUGH
10	MODIFICATION WOULD MERIT A NEW GRANTS WORKING GROUP
11	REVIEW.
12	SO JUST AS A REMINDER, THE PREVIOUS AWARDS
13	WERE THREE YEARS IN DURATION, BUT THEY WERE RENEWED
14	BY THE RFA FOR AN ADDITIONAL THREE YEARS AND THEN A
15	BOARD APPROVED EXTENSION FOR THREE YEARS. SO THEY
16	WERE FUNCTIONING NINE YEARS IN TOTAL.
17	AND THAT CONCLUDES MY POINTS FOR
18	CONSIDERATION. AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I'LL BE ON
19	STANDBY IF ANYBODY HAS ANY QUESTIONS THEY WOULD LIKE
20	TO DIRECT TO MY ATTENTION.
21	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, KELLY. SO THIS
22	PROGRAM HASN'T BEEN ACTIVE RECENTLY. THE PROPOSALS
23	OUT THERE ARE TO GET IT UP TO DATE AND ALSO PROVIDE
24	FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PROGRAM. THE QUESTION WE
25	HAVE FOR THE BOARD IS, LOOKING AT WHAT YOU SEE

1	TODAY, WOULD YOU BE READY TO CONSIDER THIS FOR THE
2	FEBRUARY BOARD MEETING? TIMELINEWISE, WORKING WITH
3	THE TEAM, I THINK FEASIBLY WE ARE THINKING ABOUT A
4	LATE SUMMER REVIEW. SO FROM THOSE OF THE BOARD
5	MEMBERS WHO ARE AT THE UNIVERSITIES, WHAT DOES THAT
6	MEAN FROM KIND OF THE OPERATIONS PART? IF WE
7	LAUNCHED THIS AND TRIED TO GET THIS GOING, WOULD IT
8	BE IMPACTFUL FOR YOU IN YOUR PLANNING AND HOW YOU
9	CONSIDER THIS IN YOUR OWN INSTITUTIONS SHOULD YOUR
10	INSTITUTION RECEIVE ONE OF THESE TRAINING AWARDS?
11	SO WITH THAT, CHAIRMAN THOMAS, I TURN IT
12	BACK TO YOU FOR THE DISCUSSION.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ARE THERE COMMENTS? I
14	KNOW WE'VE HAD SOME EARLIER COMMENTS DEALING WITH
15	THE TRAINING GRANT ISSUE EARLIER THIS MORNING. ARE
16	THERE COMMENTS NOW ON THIS PROGRAM HERE AS DR.
17	SHEPARD HAS LAID IT OUT?
18	DR. BLUMENTHAL: I THINK THIS IS A GREAT
19	PROGRAM. AND I REALLY AM EXCITED AT THE POSSIBILITY
20	OF RELAUNCHING IT. I THINK IT COULD REALLY
21	ACCOMPLISH A LOT.
22	I GUESS I WOULD JUST MAKE TWO ADDITIONAL
23	COMMENTS. ONE IS I WANT TO REITERATE SOMETHING THAT
24	ALLISON SAID EARLIER ABOUT THE OTHER EDUCATION
25	PROGRAMS. IT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE ACCOUNTABILITY

1	MEASURES AT THE END OF THE DAY. THIS PROGRAM, IT
2	COULD BE DIVERSITY MEASURES, IT COULD BE NUMBER OF
3	PAPERS WRITTEN, IT COULD BE SOME MEASURE OF WHERE
4	THESE PEOPLE GO ON AFTERWARDS. I THINK IT'S REALLY
5	IMPORTANT TO HAVE THAT.
6	MY OTHER COMMENT CONCERNS THE ISSUE OF A
7	FIXED AWARD AMOUNT. I AM SOMEWHAT CONCERNED THAT IF
8	WE FIX THE AWARD AMOUNT TO EACH PROGRAM, SOME
9	PROGRAMS ARE LARGER THAN OTHERS AND CAN ACCOMMODATE
10	MORE POTENTIAL TRAINEES. SO I'D REALLY LIKE TO
11	UNDERSTAND BETTER THE REASONING BEHIND THE IDEA OF A
12	FIXED AWARD AMOUNT BEFORE I COULD REALLY ENDORSE
13	THAT IDEA. OTHER THAN THAT, I THINK IT'S A REALLY
14	GREAT IDEA.
15	DR. MILLAN: CHAIRMAN THOMAS, WOULD YOU
16	LIKE ME TO ADDRESS THE QUESTION ABOUT THE FIXED
17	AWARD AMOUNT?
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE.
19	DR. MILLAN: THE IDEA OF A FIXED AWARD
20	AMOUNT IS IT WOULD BE AN UP-TO AMOUNT. IN THE PAST,
21	DR. SHEPARD AND DR. SAMBRANO, WHO'S ALSO ON THIS
22	CALL, WERE ACTUALLY DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THESE
23	PROGRAMS. IN THE PAST WITH THESE TRAININGS, WHAT
24	HAPPENED IS THAT THE GRANTEES THE APPLICANTS WERE
25	ASKED TO DO A SOMEWHAT CALCULATION OF WHETHER THEY

1	HAD A MEDICAL SCHOOL OR NOT AND IF THEY WERE A PURE
2	RESEARCH INSTITUTION. AND THEN BASED ON THAT, THERE
3	WAS KIND OF BUDGET CALCULATIONS. AND IT BECAME KIND
4	OF A MOVING TARGET AT TIMES. IT WAS TOUGH IN SOME
5	INSTITUTIONS TO GUARANTEE THAT THEY'LL HAVE EXACT
6	AMOUNT OF M.D.'S VERSUS PH.D.'S IN A GIVEN YEAR
7	BECAUSE, AS WE KNOW, IN AN ACADEMIC INSTITUTION,
8	DEPENDING ON WHAT TYPE OF RESEARCH IS BEING DONE AND
9	THE TRAINEES THAT ARE AVAILABLE, IT MAY VARY.
10	SO INTENT BEHIND HAVING AN AWARD AMOUNT
11	THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO ALL INSTITUTIONS IS IT
12	WOULD NOT MAKE ANY ASSUMPTIONS, FOR INSTANCE, THAT A
13	PURELY RESEARCH INSTITUTION THAT DOES NOT HAVE A
14	MEDICAL SCHOOL, FOR INSTANCE, IT DOESN'T MAKE THE
15	ASSUMPTION THAT THEY WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO GET M.D.'S
16	INTO THE LABS. SO THEY COULD ANTICIPATE FOR OR
17	RECRUIT FOR THAT AND HAVE THAT ABILITY. THAT'S THE
18	FIRST CASE OF THAT.
19	THE SECOND POINT OF THAT IS THAT COULD
20	PROMOTE KIND OF CROSS-INSTITUTION COLLABORATIONS
21	AMONG LABS THAT BRING SOME CLINICAL TO THE BASIC
22	SCIENCE AND VICE VERSA. SO THAT'S THE IDEA. IT'S
23	AN UP-TO AMOUNT. IT WOULD NOT BE PRESCRIPTIVE.
24	IT'S NOT INTENDED TO SAY THAT IF YOU CAN'T FILL UP,
25	YOU CAN'T USE THIS FULL AMOUNT, BUT YOU WOULD NOT BE
	120

1	AS COMPETITIVE FOR THE AWARD. I HOPE THAT
2	CLARIFIES. I'M HAPPY TO TAKE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS.
3	AS I SAID, GIL SAMBRANO, WHO MANAGED THIS VERY
4	DIRECTLY, IS ALSO ON THIS LINE.
5	DR. BLUMENTHAL: THANK YOU. THAT'S A GOOD
6	ANSWER TO THE QUESTION.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS?
8	DR. GOLDSTEIN: I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT
9	OUR EXPERIENCE WITH TRAINEES SUPPORTED BY THIS
10	MECHANISM WAS GENERALLY REALLY TERRIFIC. AND
11	BUNDLING THE M.D./CLINICAL FELLOWS TOGETHER WITH THE
12	GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POST DOCS IN COURSEWORK AND IN
13	TRAINING ACTIVITIES DID A LOT TO EXPOSE THOSE M.D.'S
14	TO SCIENCE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POST DOCS TO
15	MEDICINE. I LIKE THE IDEA OF EXPANDING THAT IN THE
16	WAY YOU'VE SUGGESTED.
17	AND I JUST WANT TO MAKE A FINAL
18	SUGGESTION. WITH NIH TRAINING GRANTS AT LEAST, ONE
19	OF THE WAYS THAT IS USED TO DECIDE HOW BIG THE AWARD
20	SHOULD BE AND HOW MANY TRAINEES THEY SHOULD HAVE IS
21	DOCUMENTATION OF THE TRAINEE EXPERIENCE OF THE
22	INSTITUTION AND THE SIZE OF THE PROGRAMS AND THE
23	QUALITY OF THE STUDENTS. THAT'S A VERY
24	STRAIGHTFORWARD WAY OF DOING AT LEAST THE GRADUATE
25	STUDENT PART OF THIS AND PROBABLY ADAPTABLE FOR THE

1	POST-DOCS AS WELL.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR.
3	GOLDSTEIN. OTHER COMMENTS?
4	SO I HAVE A QUESTION WHICH IS, IN NOTING
5	THAT THERE ARE CONSIDERATIONS TO BRING THE PROGRAM
6	UP TO CURRENT DAY, REFLECTIVE OF VARIOUS CONDITIONS
7	AS WELL AS THE OTHER CONSIDERATIONS THAT YOU SET
8	FORTH HERE, DO WE HAVE THE BENEFIT OF OR LET ME
9	REPHRASE THAT. IS THIS INFORMED IN PART BY INPUT
10	FROM EXISTING PROGRAM RECORDS, AND DO WE HAVE
11	OPPORTUNITY TO CANVASS THEM TO GET THEIR THOUGHTS ON
12	HOW ONE MIGHT IMPROVE THINGS?
13	DR. MILLAN: SO WE'VE BEEN RECEIVING
14	CONTINUAL KIND OF FEEDBACK FROM VARIOUS, NOT THE
15	OPERATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS OF THE PROGRAM
16	THEMSELVES, BUT FROM THE USERS OF THE PROGRAM AND
17	THE LEADERS OF THE INSTITUTIONS WHO HAVE HOSTED
18	THESE PROGRAMS. SO THAT'S WHERE WE'VE BEEN
19	CONTINUALLY RECEIVING INPUT.
20	THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS, WE CERTAINLY COULD
21	REACH OUT TO THEM. THE QUESTION IS AND WE CAN
22	HAVE A MORE EXTENSIVE TIME PERIOD TO DEVELOP THIS
23	CONCEPT. THE CONSIDERATIONS THAT DR. SHEPARD PUT
24	FORWARD IS THAT WE HEARD FROM AND SEEN IN
25	PUBLICATIONS THAT THE COVID PANDEMIC HAD IMPACTED

1	THE ABILITY OF THESE TRAINEES TO GAIN INTERNSHIPS IN
2	RESEARCH POSITIONS, AND MANY OF THOSE HAVE BEEN
3	CANCELED. AND SO WE THOUGHT THAT AT THIS TIME
4	PERIOD DURING THE REBUILD THAT IT WOULD BE CRITICAL
5	THAT WE MADE SURE THAT WE PROVIDED THIS OPPORTUNITY
6	FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE PROGRAMS TO BRING IN
7	TRAINEES.
8	AND SO IT'S REALLY, I THINK, WHAT YOU'RE
9	POINTING TO IS TIMING. IF YOU THINK THAT WE SHOULD
10	DO A MORE FORMAL KIND OF AUDIT OF THE PREVIOUS
11	INSTITUTIONS WHICH BY THE WAY, HAVE NOT BEEN ACTIVE
12	IN YEARS, SO I DON'T EVEN KNOW IF THOSE PROGRAM
13	DIRECTORS ARE STILL THERE, BUT, YEAH, WE COULD DO
14	THAT. I THINK WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO SEEK FROM THE
15	BOARD IS IS IT YOUR SENSE AS LEADERS WITHIN THESE
16	RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR THIS
17	NOW BECAUSE IT IF THERE'S NO URGENT NEED FOR A LOT
18	OF REASONS, WE CAN TAKE MORE TIME TO DEVELOP THIS
19	AND MAYBE ADD MORE TO IT. BUT WE DO BELIEVE IT'S IN
20	A VERY GOOD STATE, AND THE PROPOSALS WE'RE BRINGING
21	FORWARD WOULD ALLOW THE STRONGEST PROPOSALS TO COME
22	IN BECAUSE, AFTER ALL, AS YOU KNOW, IT'S UP TO THE
23	APPLICANTS TO ACTUALLY BRING FORWARD THEIR STRONGEST
24	PLANS AND TO MAKE THE CASE FOR WHY THEIR INSTITUTION
25	WOULD BE VERY WELL POSITIONED AND WELL SUITED TO

1	PROVIDE THIS RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. AND THEY WOULD
2	BE THE ONES THAT PROVIDED THE FACULTY WHO WOULD HOST
3	THESE STUDENTS AND THE RESEARCH PROJECTS.
4	SO NONE OF THAT WOULD BE INFORMED ANY
5	FURTHER BECAUSE THAT WOULD COME IN VIA THE
6	APPLICATION AND THE REVIEW.
7	SO I'LL LEAVE IT AT THAT. WE REALLY
8	WELCOME THE BOARD'S DIRECTION IN TERMS OF TIMING FOR
9	THIS.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO ARE THERE OTHER
11	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, PARTICULARLY
12	THOSE FROM INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE BENEFITED FROM THE
13	TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM IN THE PAST?
14	DR. SANDMEYER: I SECOND THE SENTIMENTS OF
15	THE CHAT FROM DAVIS, THAT I THINK IT WOULD BE A VERY
16	EXCITING PROGRAM. WASN'T CLEAR TO ME IF ALL THE
17	PROGRAMS WOULD HAVE TO ROLL OUT AGAIN. I THINK,
18	MARIA, YOU CONCENTRATED MOSTLY ON THIS RESEARCH
19	TRAINING ONE THAT IS THE LAST ONE THAT WAS
20	DISCUSSED, BUT I THINK THERE'S ABSOLUTELY A NEED FOR
21	THIS GIVEN THE IMPACT OF COVID ON TRAINING, MORALE,
22	ABILITY TO GET JOBS MOVING ON.
23	BUT YOU MENTIONED LATE SUMMER REVIEW TIME
24	FRAME. SO DOES THE STAFF I ASSUME YOU HAVE SOME
25	KIND OF A TIMELINE IN PLACE FOR HOW LONG IT WOULD
	122

1	TAKE TO ACTUALLY DRAFT THE RFA AND THEN PUT IT OUT
2	FOR PLACES TO HAVE TIME TO FORMULATE THEIR PLANS.
3	DR. MILLAN: DR. SANDMEYER, WE HAD MODELED
4	THIS OUT, THE LEADERSHIP TEAM. AND THEN THE
5	CONVERSATION LED BY DR. GIL SAMBRANO, WHO IS THE
6	HEAD OF REVIEW, AND HE THOUGHT THAT, OF COURSE,
7	EVERYTHING WE ARE PROPOSING TODAY IS ON AN
8	AGGRESSIVE TIMELINE, BUT WHAT WE DID WAS A
9	FEASIBILITY EVALUATION IN TERMS OF ALL THE STEPS
10	THAT NEEDED TO BE IN PLACE, AND IT WASN'T JUST
11	REVIEW, ALL THE OPERATIONAL COMPONENTS OF OUR
12	ORGANIZATION, AND WE BELIEVE THAT IT'S DOABLE WITH
13	ALL THE STEPS PRECEDING THE REVIEW TO HAVE THE
14	REVIEW BY LATE SUMMER, JULY, AUGUST.
15	THE QUESTION IS IS THAT IMPACTFUL FOR THE
16	ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, WHICH WOULD BE THE GRANTEES OF
17	THESE RESEARCH TRAINING AWARDS? WOULD THAT HELP YOU
18	IN ADDRESSING THE NEED SUCH AS THAT WHICH WAS
19	IMPOSED BY THE COVID CRISIS IF WE ARE LIMITED TO
20	DOING THIS AT THE EARLIEST LATE SUMMER? THAT'S THE;
21	QUESTION. WE WANT TO BE ABLE TO OFFER IT AT SOME
22	POINT, BUT THE QUESTION IS TIMING. SO BECAUSE
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS HAD ASKED DOES THIS NEED MORE
24	DEVELOPMENT, WE BELIEVE THIS IS A STRONG PROPOSAL,
25	BUT WE CERTAINLY COULD TAKE MORE TIME TO JUST RUN IT
	122

1	THROUGH ADDITIONAL STAKEHOLDERS AND INPUT. IF YOU
2	DON'T FEEL THAT IT WOULD BE IMPACTFUL WITH THE TYPE
3	OF TIMELINE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT, WHICH IS NOT
4	FUNDING UNTIL LATE SUMMER, EARLY FALL.
5	DR. SANDMEYER: I DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S
6	TOO LATE TO AVOID THE IMPACTS OF COVID. I'M JUST
7	CONCERNED THAT PLACES HAVE TIME TO FORMULATE CAREFUL
8	PLANS GIVEN THAT YOU'VE DONE A LOT OF LAYING THE
9	GROUNDWORK. WILL INSTITUTIONS HAVE AN APPROPRIATE
10	AMOUNT OF TIME? THAT'S ALL. I THINK THE TIMING
11	LATE SUMMER SEEMS REASONABLE.
12	DR. MILLAN: I BELIEVE GIL BUILT INTO
13	THAT. GIL IS ON THE LINE, BUT I THINK WE BUILT A
14	THREE- TO FOUR-MONTH I'M SORRY ABOUT A THREE-
15	TO FOUR
16	DR. MELMED: MARIA, I THINK IT'S VERY
17	IMPORTANT THAT WE ALL RECOGNIZE THAT INTERVIEWS ARE
18	VERY DIFFICULT.
19	DR. MILLAN: WE CAN'T HEAR YOU, DR.
20	MELMED. I'M SORRY. YOU'RE CUTTING IN AND OUT.
21	DR. MELMED: CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW? CAN YOU
22	HEAR ME NOW?
23	DR. MILLAN: YES.
24	DR. MELMED: I'M JUST SAYING THAT
25	INTERVIEWS ARE VERY DIFFICULT NOW ANYWAY. SO I

134

1	THINK THREE OR FOUR MONTHS DELAY WHILE WE BECOME
2	MORE GRANULAR IN OUR RECOMMENDATIONS I THINK WOULD
3	BE HELPFUL BECAUSE CANDIDATES ARE VERY, VERY
4	RELUCTANT TO TRAVEL FOR INTERVIEWS ANYWAY. SO
5	HAVING A DELAY TILL THE SUMMER, I THINK, IS NOT
6	GOING TO BE IN ANY WAY DETRIMENTAL.
7	DR. MILLAN: SO, DR. MELMED, JUST TO
8	RESTATE TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE HEARING IT, THAT IF
9	WE DIDN'T LAUNCH A PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT THAT WE
10	OPENED UP IN MAYBE EARLY Q2 WITH SOMETHING LEADING
11	TO A REVIEW BY LATE SUMMER, SAY, AUGUST, AND THEN
12	THE SUCCESSFUL GRANTEES WOULD HAVE THE ABILITY TO
13	START THIS PROGRAM IN THE FALL, I'M HEARING FROM YOU
14	THAT YOU THINK THAT THAT WOULD STILL WORK OUT WITH
15	THE TIMELINES REGARDING WHAT YOU ON THE INSTITUTION
16	SIDE HAVE TO GO THROUGH WITH YOUR POTENTIAL TRAINEES
17	AS WELL.
18	DR. MELMED: YES. YES.
19	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU.
20	DR. MELMED: IT'S GOING TO TAKE MANY
21	MONTHS.
22	DR. GASSON: I'D LIKE TO SECOND WHAT DR.
23	MELMED SAID. AND I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO ECHO THE
24	DESIRE TO SEE SOME OUTCOME DATA ON THIS PROGRAM. WE
25	GOT SOME DATA ON THE BRIDGES AND THE SPARK PROGRAM,
	125

1	BUT IT WOULD BE GREAT TO HEAR FROM THE INSTITUTIONS
2	THEMSELVES. I KNOW THAT UCLA WAS ONE OF THE
3	INSTITUTIONS THAT REALLY BENEFITED FROM THIS
4	PROGRAM, AND WE'D REALLY WELCOME IT TO COME BACK.
5	BUT I THINK HAVING A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME TO GATHER
6	A LITTLE BIT MORE DATA WOULD BE WELL SPENT. AND
7	CERTAINLY HAVING THE FUNDING AVAILABLE IN THE FALL
8	WOULD WORK OUT JUST FINE. THANK YOU.
9	DR. MILLAN: DR. GASSON I'M SORRY,
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS. IS IT OKAY IF I JUST FOLLOW UP ON
11	THAT?
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE.
13	DR. MILLAN: DR. GASSON, JUST FOR KIND OF
14	THE NEXT STEPS, WE ARE PROPOSING TO BRING THIS
15	CONCEPT PROPOSAL TO YOU, TO THE BOARD, IN FEBRUARY,
16	NEXT MONTH, FOR APPROVAL SO THAT WE CAN GET ALL
17	THESE PIECES IN PLACE. THE DATA OUTCOME MEASURES
18	THAT YOU'RE REQUESTING, WOULD YOU LIKE THAT TO BE IN
19	PLACE BEFORE WE BRING THE CONCEPT PROPOSAL TO THE
20	BOARD?
21	DR. GASSON: YES, I THINK SO.
22	DR. MILLAN: OKAY. SO I'LL WORK WITH THE
23	TEAM TO DETERMINE HOW DEVELOPED THAT COULD BE, OR
24	HOW WELL DEVELOPED THE DATA CAPTURE WAS ON THAT.
25	AND WHAT WE WILL PLAN TO DO, THEN, IF THE BOARD

1	AGREES CHAIRMAN THOMAS, I'LL HAND IT BACK TO YOU
2	TO DISCUSS THAT IS BRING A CONCEPT PROPOSAL NEXT
3	MONTH ALONG WITH WHATEVER DATA WE CAN GATHER SO THAT
4	THE BOARD CAN MAKE THE FINAL DETERMINATION NEXT
5	MONTH IF THEY FEEL COMFORTABLE WITH APPROVING THE
6	CONCEPT THAT WE BRING TO YOU NEXT MONTH ALONG WITH A
7	PROPOSED BUDGET.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. MILLAN, GIVEN THE
9	DATA CAPTURE REQUEST DR. GASSON AND OTHER COMMENTS
10	FROM INTEGRATING IN THE RESULTS AND THOUGHTS FROM
11	PREVIOUS AWARDEES ON THIS, DOES THAT GIVE YOU ENOUGH
12	TIME TO BE ABLE TO BRING THE CONCEPT PLAN IN
13	FEBRUARY?
14	DR. MILLAN: WHAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO DO
14 15	DR. MILLAN: WHAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO DO IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER
15	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER
15 16	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET
15 16 17	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH
15 16 17 18	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH INFORMATION. IF IT'S NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION, THEN
15 16 17 18 19	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH INFORMATION. IF IT'S NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION, THEN WHAT WILL HAPPEN PROBABLY IS THAT WE WOULD DELAY THE
15 16 17 18 19 20	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH INFORMATION. IF IT'S NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION, THEN WHAT WILL HAPPEN PROBABLY IS THAT WE WOULD DELAY THE RELAUNCH OF THIS SO IT WOULDN'T IMPACT UNTIL THE
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH INFORMATION. IF IT'S NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION, THEN WHAT WILL HAPPEN PROBABLY IS THAT WE WOULD DELAY THE RELAUNCH OF THIS SO IT WOULDN'T IMPACT UNTIL THE NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH INFORMATION. IF IT'S NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION, THEN WHAT WILL HAPPEN PROBABLY IS THAT WE WOULD DELAY THE RELAUNCH OF THIS SO IT WOULDN'T IMPACT UNTIL THE NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR. CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FURTHER COMMENTS FROM
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	IS BRING A MORE FULL CONCEPT PLAN WITH WHATEVER INPUT WE HAVE AT THE TIME, AND THE BOARD WOULD LET US KNOW WHETHER THEY FELT THAT THAT WAS ENOUGH INFORMATION. IF IT'S NOT ENOUGH INFORMATION, THEN WHAT WILL HAPPEN PROBABLY IS THAT WE WOULD DELAY THE RELAUNCH OF THIS SO IT WOULDN'T IMPACT UNTIL THE NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR. CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FURTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

1	A LONG TIME AGO, A LITTLE MORE THAN 55 YEARS AGO,
2	THERE WAS A TRAINING PROGRAM AT DUKE WHEN I WAS A
3	MEDICAL STUDENT. AND THIS WAS NATIONAL SCIENCE
4	FOUNDATION FUNDED FOR EIGHT PHYSICIANS AND EIGHT
5	MEDICAL STUDENTS. AND A PROGRAM THAT TRAINED THEM
6	TO DO SCIENCE AND MIXED THE MEDICAL STUDENTS, MANY
7	OF WHOM HAD PH.D'S. AT THAT POINT, AND THE
8	PHYSICIANS. AND THE PHYSICIANS WERE USUALLY INTERNS
9	OR RESIDENTS WHO WERE GIVEN TIME OFF TO TRAIN THEM,
10	TO TRAIN THEM HOW TO DO SCIENCE AND TO MIX WITH
11	PHYSICIANS.
12	THIS LASTED ABOUT EIGHT OR NINE YEARS AND
13	WAS THE PREDECESSOR TO THE NIH-FUNDED MEDICAL
14	SCIENTIST TRAINING PROGRAMS OR THE MSTP'S. AND THEN
15	NIH FUNDED THAT, AND IT HAS BECOME, AS YOU KNOW, NOW
16	AN INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM FOR TRAINING PHYSICIANS AND
17	BASIC SCIENTISTS IN BOTH FIELDS. AND IT HAS BEEN
18	EXTRAORDINARILY IMPORTANT IN RESEARCH SCIENCE AND
19	MEDICINE, AND IT WAS SUCH AN IMPORTANT PRECEDENT.
20	THIS SOUNDS VERY MUCH LIKE THAT, AND I REALLY LIKE
21	THE IDEA OF PUTTING TOGETHER PHYSICIANS, MEDICAL
22	STUDENTS, AND A PH.D.'S TO UNDERSTAND THE RELEVANCE
23	OF RESEARCH TO MEDICINE AND VICE VERSA. I THINK
24	THAT IS REALLY CRITICAL. AND THIS COULD BE A
25	PRECEDENT FOR DOING A VERY SIMILAR THING WITH STEM

1	CELL RESEARCH AND MEDICINE.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. MARTIN.
3	I THINK THERE'S A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF ENTHUSIASM
4	FOR THE PROGRAM FURTHER TO YOUR POINT. SO THE
5	QUESTION IS HOW CAN WE BEST MAKE THIS HAPPEN IN A
6	WAY THAT ALLOWS DR. MILLAN TO DO WITH HER TEAM WHAT
7	SHE NEEDS TO DO?
8	JUST ONE CLARIFYING QUESTION, DR. MILLAN.
9	SO IS FEBRUARY SORT OF, IN YOUR ESTIMATION, THE
10	LATEST YOU COULD BRING THE CONCEPT FOR DISCUSSION TO
11	ENABLE GETTING THE PROGRAM FUNDED FOR THE NEXT
12	ACADEMIC YEAR?
13	DR. MILLAN: I HAVE TO CONFIRM WITH MY
14	TEAM. I THINK THERE MIGHT BE MAYBE A MONTH OR SO,
15	AND WHAT WILL HAPPEN IS, IF WE DON'T BRING THE
16	CONCEPT UNTIL MARCH OR APRIL, FOR INSTANCE, THAT
17	JUST MEANS SHORTER TIME FOR THE APPLICANTS TO
18	PREPARE THEIR APPLICATION. AGAIN, ASSUMING WE'RE
19	TRYING TO GET THIS PROGRAM LAUNCHED BY THE FALL OF
20	THIS COMING YEAR, WHICH IS THE NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR.
21	IT REALLY IS A TIMING ISSUE. SO I GUESS WE WOULD
22	REALLY SEEK INPUT FROM THE BOARD AS TO THE URGENCY
23	OF THIS PROGRAM, WHICH IT SOUNDS LIKE THERE'S A LOT
24	OF ENTHUSIASM FOR IT, THAT WILL HELP US REALLY
25	DETERMINE THE BEST WAY TO BRING THIS BACK TO YOU.

1	BECAUSE IF YOU, FOR INSTANCE, SAID TODAY THERE'S NO
2	URGENCY TO BRING IT IN THIS YEAR, THEN THAT WOULD
3	CHANGE THINGS. SO I GUESS THAT'S KIND OF THE
4	CRITICAL GATING ITEM FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE.
5	DR. SAMBRANO, IF YOU COULD COMMENT. IF WE
6	WERE TO BRING THIS TO A MARCH, WHICH BY THE WAY IS
7	THE BOARD RETREAT, SO WE'D HAVE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT
8	WHETHER IT'S APPROPRIATE TO BRING THIS TO A BOARD
9	RETREAT BECAUSE IT WOULD BE AN ACTION. AND THEN
10	BEYOND THAT, I THINK APRIL WOULD BE REALLY LATE
11	BECAUSE BY THEN IT WILL GIVE THEM NOT EVEN TWO
12	MONTHS TO GET THE APPLICATION BECAUSE IT'S A
13	TWO-MONTH AT LEAST CYCLE TO GET THE REVIEW DONE.
14	SO THIS IS KIND OF A TIMING DISCUSSION
15	RIGHT NOW, AND I HESITATE TO BRING A TACTICAL AND
16	TIMING ISSUE TO THE BOARD, BUT I GUESS THE REAL
17	QUESTION IS IT SOUNDS LIKE THERE'S ENTHUSIASM FOR
18	RESEARCH TRAINING AS DESCRIBED, AND IT'S JUST NOW WE
19	ARE ASKING FOR GUIDANCE REGARDING TIMING.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARIA, TO INTERJECT.
21	THERE MAY BE SOME APPLICATIONS THAT GO TO THE BOARD
22	IN MARCH ANYWAY. SO THERE WILL BE ACTION ITEMS
23	PRIOR TO THE START OF THE BOARD RETREAT IF THAT'S
24	HELPFUL IN ANY WAY.
25	DR. MILLAN: AND IF THAT WAS THE CASE,
	140

1	JUST FOR SAKE OF AND I'M GOING TO AGAIN TURN IT
2	OVER TO GIL. IF, LET'S SAY, WE BRING IT TO THE
3	BOARD IN MARCH AND WE HAVE A MORE DEVELOPED SET OF,
4	AT LEAST, WHAT OUTCOME MEASURES WE HAVE TO DATE, AND
5	WE'RE NOT GOING TO CREATE NEW OUTCOME MEASURES.
6	OBVIOUSLY THESE PROGRAMS ARE NO LONGER IN EXISTENCE.
7	SO WHATEVER WE HAVE WE'LL HAVE. IF WE BRING IT TO
8	YOU NEXT MONTH OR MARCH, THAT WILL GIVE APPLICANTS
9	AND YOU, AND IT'S APPROVED, THEN IT WILL GIVE
10	APPLICANTS EITHER TWO MONTHS OR THREE MONTHS FOR THE
11	APPLICATION PREPARATION IN ORDER TO HIT A TIMELINE
12	OF AN AUGUST REVIEW, FOR INSTANCE. SO THAT'S KIND
13	OF THE BASIC TIMELINE TO CONSIDER.
14	DR. MELMED: MARIA, CAN YOU HEAR ME?
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. IT'S SORT OF
16	PATCHY.
17	DR. MELMED: CAN YOU HEAR ME, MARIA? I
18	THINK WE SHOULD NOT LET THE QUALITY OF THE PROPOSAL
19	BE DRIVEN BY TIMELINES. IF YOU NEED AN EXTRA MONTH
20	TO GET A BETTER QUALITY PROPOSAL, TAKE THE EXTRA
21	MONTH OR TWO. WHATEVER IT TAKES TO GET THE BEST
22	POSSIBLE PROPOSAL THAT REFLECTS THE BOARD'S WISHES.
23	I DON'T THINK THAT A MONTH HERE OR THERE IS GOING TO
24	MAKE THAT MUCH DIFFERENCE TO THE QUALITY OF THE
25	APPLICANT.

1	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, DR. MELMED. BUT
2	MAY I ASK DO YOU THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE IT IN
3	PLACE THIS YEAR?
4	DR. MELMED: I THINK EVERY LAB WILL SAY
5	YES.
6	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU.
7	DR. MELMED: WE SHOULD JUST GET THE BEST
8	PROPOSAL OUT THERE, WHATEVER IT TAKES TO DEVELOP.
9	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. MILLAN.
11	DR. GOLDSTEIN: IF I MAY INTERJECT HERE
12	BRIEFLY.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY.
14	DR. GOLDSTEIN: DR. MILLAN, ONE OF THE
15	ISSUES THAT SEEMS TO BE DELAYING A POTENTIAL START
16	FROM FEBRUARY TO MARCH IS OUTCOME MEASURES. SO I
17	WOULD MAKE THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO THE OUTCOME
18	MEASURE DISCUSSION TO ASK THE APPLICANTS TO PROVIDE
19	OUTCOME MEASURES IN THEIR GRANT APPLICATIONS. AND
20	THEY'LL HAVE ACCESS TO THE BEST INFORMATION, AND IT
21	WON'T PUT YOUR STAFF ON THE SPOT AND WILL AVOID THAT
22	ONE-MONTH DELAY TO OUTCOME DATA, WHICH MAY OR MAY
23	NOT BE ACHIEVABLE.
24	DR. MILLAN: THAT'S A GREAT THAT IS
25	ACTUALLY SOMETHING WE WOULD ASK THEM FOR ANYWAY.

1	THANK YOU FOR MAKING THAT POINT, DR. GOLDSTEIN.
2	AND SO I'LL TURN IT OVER TO YOU, CHAIRMAN
3	THOMAS, IN TERMS OF LEADING THE DISCUSSION AS TO
4	WHETHER THE BOARD FEELS THAT THAT WOULD BE A GOOD
5	WAY FOR US TO SEE THE OUTCOME MEASURES.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I DO THINK THAT'S A VERY
7	GOOD SUGGESTION, DR. GOLDSTEIN. AND I THINK THAT
8	YOU'LL GET FULL CONSENSUS THAT, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE,
9	WE WOULD ABSOLUTELY WANT TO HAVE THIS PROGRAM
10	EFFECTIVE THIS FALL. SO THE QUESTION IS JUST GIVING
11	DR. MILLAN AND DR. SAMBRANO AND TEAM JUST THE
12	DISCRETION FOR YOU TO LET US KNOW IF YOU CAN BRING
13	THIS IN FEBRUARY AND YOU FEEL AND PERHAPS WITH
14	DR. GOLDSTEIN'S SUGGESTION INTEGRATED INTO IT, THAT
15	WOULD HELP MAKE THE FEBRUARY DATE MORE VIABLE. IF
16	YOU COULD JUST
17	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE'LL
18	BE ABLE TO DO THAT, AND WE WILL DEFINITELY MAKE
19	SURE, AS WE ALWAYS DO, THE BEST DEVELOPED CONCEPT
20	PROPOSALS TO YOU. AND WE'LL DOUBLE-CHECK WITH MY
21	ENTIRE TEAM, BUT THE BEAUTY OF THAT IS THAT ALL OF
22	THE EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT WE HOPE TO LAUNCH THIS
23	YEAR CAN BE BROUGHT TO YOU, AND YOU CAN LOOK AT ALL
24	OF THEM AT THE SAME TIME IN FEBRUARY. BUT, AGAIN,
25	WE'LL BE BACK. WE REALLY APPRECIATE THIS GUIDANCE
	1/13

1	FROM THE BOARD. THANK YOU.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. SAMBRANO, DO YOU
3	HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS ON THIS DISCUSSION?
4	DR. SAMBRANO: NOT IN PARTICULAR. I THINK
5	IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND HOW MUCH TIME THE
6	INSTITUTIONS WOULD NEED TO FORMULATE AN APPLICATION
7	BECAUSE WE DO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE'S PROBABLY A LOT
8	THAT HAS TO HAPPEN WITH THE INSTITUTION ON DECIDING
9	WHO THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR MAY BE AND HOW TO STRUCTURE
10	IT. SO I WOULD WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S
11	SUFFICIENT TIME FOR THAT.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANY OTHER
13	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS SUBJECT?
14	THANK YOU. I HOPE, DR. MILLAN, THAT THIS HAS BEEN
15	HELPFUL.
16	DR. MILLAN: EXTREMELY HELPFUL. THANK YOU
17	SO MUCH.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO I BELIEVE WE
19	ARE ON TO OUR NEXT TOPIC; IS THAT CORRECT, DR.
20	MILLAN?
21	DR. MILLAN: YES, WE ARE, AND THESE WILL
22	BE SHORT. ALTHOUGH REALLY KIND OF CONDENSED
23	INFORMATION, DR. SAMBRANO IS GOING TO GIVE AN UPDATE
24	ON THE OUTCOME OF THE SHARED LABS PROGRAM. AS YOU
25	RECALL, AT THE START OF THIS PRESENTATION, WE EXPECT
	144
	144

1	THAT WE'D BE BRINGING BACK TO YOU SOMETIME IN Q3 FOR
2	LAUNCH IN Q4 AND THAT'S A TARGET DATE, BUT I'D LIKE
3	DR. SAMBRANO TO GO AHEAD AND GIVE THIS PRESENTATION
4	TO LEAD THE DISCUSSION. THANK YOU.
5	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU. AND GOOD
6	AFTERNOON TO EVERYONE. I JUST HAVE ONE SLIDE.
7	GEOFF, IF YOU COULD JUST ADVANCE TO IT. AND IT'S
8	REALLY PROVIDING YOU JUST SOME BACKGROUND ON THE
9	PROGRAM AS IT WAS CREATED BACK IN 2007.
10	SO THIS WAS PART OF WHAT CIRM CALLED ITS
11	JUMP START PROGRAM, WHICH WAS TO ENABLE AND
12	ENCOURAGE INVESTIGATORS IN CALIFORNIA TO CONDUCT
13	HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH. AND SO IF YOU
14	LOOK AT THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RFA THAT WAS ISSUED AT
15	THAT TIME, IT HAD KIND OF A TWOFOLD SET OF GOALS.
16	FIRST, TO CREATE DEDICATED LABORATORY SPACE FOR THE
17	CULTURE AND MAINTENANCE OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM
18	CELLS, IN PARTICULAR, THOSE LINES THAT FALL OUTSIDE
19	FEDERAL GUIDELINES, AND ALSO TO SUPPORT THOSE CORE
20	LABORATORIES BY HAVING MULTIPLE INVESTIGATORS
21	CONDUCTING THE RESEARCH AT THE HOME INSTITUTION AS
22	WELL AS NEIGHBORING RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS.
23	AND THEN WITH THE PROGRAM WAS ALSO THE
24	OPTION OF HAVING THE STEM CELL TECHNIQUES COURSE
25	WHICH INTENDED TO TRAIN SCIENTISTS AND TECHNICAL

1	STAFF IN THE GROWTH AND MAINTENANCE OF HUMAN
2	EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS BY FUNDING A NUMBER OF HANDS-ON
3	COURSES. AND, OF COURSE, THOSE, AS MENTIONED
4	EARLIER, EVOLVED INTO ALSO SERVING THE NEEDS OF THE
5	BRIDGES PROGRAM AS MANY OF THE BRIDGES TRAINEES TOOK
6	ADVANTAGE OF THOSE COURSES IN ORDER TO GET THEIR
7	RESPECTIVE TRAINING.
8	SO ALTHOUGH THIS WAS ORIGINALLY LAID OUT
9	IN THIS WAY, I THINK OVER TIME IT EVOLVED INTO ALSO
10	PROVIDING IPSC AND OTHER STEM CELL LINES AND THE
11	OPPORTUNITY FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH THAT
12	EXPANDED KIND OF AS THE FIELD DID AS WELL. AND SO
13	THE WAY THESE AWARDS WERE STRUCTURED, THEY KIND OF
14	HAVE TWO DIFFERENT COMPONENTS. ONE WAS THE
15	RENOVATION AND EQUIPMENT. IT PROVIDED ONE MILLION
16	IN RENOVATION COSTS. SO THE EXPECTATION WAS THAT
17	THE INSTITUTIONS WOULD HAVE AN AVAILABLE SPACE THAT
18	THEY WOULD WISH TO RENOVATE AS WELL AS TO EQUIP WITH
19	MAJOR EQUIPMENT THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR CELL
20	CULTURE AND SO ON.
21	THERE WAS A 20-PERCENT MATCH THAT WAS
22	EXPECTED WITH EACH OF THESE. THERE WAS ALSO THE
23	OPERATIONAL COSTS WHICH WOULD COVER PERSONNEL AND
24	SUPPLIES. SO TYPICALLY THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR PLUS A
25	COUPLE OF TECHNICIANS WAS THE TYPICAL FORMAT. AND
	146

1	IT OFFERED 200,000 PER YEAR TO DO THAT.
2	THIS WAS ORIGINALLY MUCH LIKE THE TRAINING
3	PROGRAMS THAT WERE DESCRIBED, A THREE-YEAR AWARD
4	THAT WAS EXTENDED FOR AN ADDITIONAL THREE YEARS. SO
5	THE OPERATIONS WERE SUPPORTED FOR A TOTAL OF SIX
6	YEARS. AND THEN THOSE THAT OFFERED THE TECHNIQUES
7	COURSE, THEY RECEIVED AN ADDITIONAL 200,000 IN ORDER
8	TO SUPPORT THE PERSONNEL AND EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT.
9	SO OUR TOTAL INVESTMENT INTO THE SHARED LABS PROGRAM
10	BETWEEN 2007 AND 2014 WAS ABOUT 69 MILLION.
11	IN TERMS OF THE OUTCOMES, WHAT IT DID IT
12	ESTABLISHED 17 DIFFERENT PROGRAMS, WHICH WE OFTEN
13	REFER TO AS SAFE HAVENS, FOR CONDUCTING HUMAN
14	EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH BECAUSE THESE WERE
15	GENERALLY FREE OF FEDERAL FUNDS. AND SO ALL OF THE
16	LABORATORIES DURING THIS TIME MAINTAINED THOSE
17	LABORATORIES WITHOUT THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS IN
18	ORDER TO BE ABLE TO CONDUCT THAT RESEARCH WITHOUT
19	WORRY ABOUT WHAT MAY HAPPEN POLITICALLY OR IN TERMS
20	OF SUDDEN CHANGES IN FEDERAL REGULATIONS.
21	IT ALSO CREATED LOTS OF SPECIALIZED CORES
22	WITH EXPERTISE IN DIFFERENT AREAS SUCH AS VECTOR
23	BIOLOGY, HIGH THROUGHPUT SCREENING, BIOENGINEERING,
24	ALL DEPENDENT ON KIND OF THE STRENGTHS OF THE
25	INSTITUTION WHERE THE SHARED LAB WAS HOSTED.

1	IT ALSO RESULTED IN 173 PUBLICATIONS. SO
2	EVEN THOUGH THE SHARED LABS THEMSELVES WERE NOT OR
3	DIDN'T HAVE AN INDEPENDENT RESEARCH PROGRAM WITHIN
4	THEM, THERE WAS A LOT OF INNOVATION HAPPENING WITHIN
5	THE SHARED LABS: DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOCOLS, NEW WAYS
6	TO DERIVE CELLS, AND SO ON, THAT LED TO THESE
7	PUBLICATIONS, AS WELL AS, OF COURSE, THE 90 PLUS
8	HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES THAT WERE DERIVED
9	AND MADE AVAILABLE.
10	AND THEN, OF COURSE, THE TECHNIQUES COURSE
11	WHICH SERVED TO TRAIN MANY INVESTIGATORS AND
12	INTRODUCE THEM TO THIS NEW FIELD AS WELL AS
13	POST-DOCS AND STUDENTS AND TECHNICAL STAFF IN ALL OF
14	THESE DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES.
15	SO THAT'S JUST A SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM,
16	AND HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS. AND IN THE
17	MEANTIME, TURN IT BACK TO DR. MILLAN.
18	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, DR. SAMBRANO.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS, I'LL TURN IT BACK TO YOU FOR
20	DISCUSSION.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I WAS SPEAKING INTO A
22	I WAS ON MUTE. YES. THANK YOU, DR. SAMBRANO. DR.
23	GOLDSTEIN, PLEASE, YOU HAVE A QUESTION, COMMENT?
24	DR. GOLDSTEIN: I WAS JUST GOING TO REMIND
25	ALL OF US THAT WE HAVE A CONTINUING NEED FOR SAFE

1	HAVEN LABORATORY SPACE IN THIS STATE. THE FEDERAL
2	GOVERNMENT HAS MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO USE FEDERAL
3	FUNDS FOR ANY RESEARCH USING HUMAN FETAL TISSUE.
4	THE DICKEY-WICKER AMENDMENT THAT AFFECTS THE
5	HANDLING OF HUMAN EMBRYOS IS STILL IN EFFECT SO THAT
6	HUMAN EMBRYOS CANNOT BE STUDIED WITH FEDERAL FUNDS.
7	AND, OF COURSE, WHO KNOWS WHAT THE SENATE IS GOING
8	TO DO IN TWO YEARS, BUT THEY COULD REALLY TRIP US
9	UP. SO THE SAFE HAVEN ISSUE IS STILL AN IMPORTANT
10	ISSUE. I KNOW THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO THINK THAT IT'S
11	NOT, BUT IT'S DOCUMENTABLY A PROBLEM.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR.
13	GOLDSTEIN. OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS SLIDE?
14	DR. SAMBRANO, THANKS VERY MUCH.
15	HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE IS VERY HELPFUL, PARTICULARLY
16	FOR NEWER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, AND SO THAT WAS A
17	VERY GOOD SUMMARY.
18	ANY FINAL COMMENTS BEFORE WE MOVE ON TO
19	THE NEXT PRESENTATION?
20	DR. SAMBRANO: NOT FROM ME.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU FOR THAT. AND
22	LET'S GO ON. IT LOOKS LIKE YOU ARE ON TAP HERE FOR
23	THE NEXT AS WELL.
24	DR. SAMBRANO: CORRECT. YES. SO IF I CAN
25	HAVE THE NEXT SLIDE. THANK YOU.

149

1	SO THIS IS A VERY SIMPLE SLIDE, AND ALL WE
2	ARE TRYING TO DO HERE IS JUST AN AWARENESS THING.
3	YOU KNOW THAT WE HAVE RELAUNCHED MANY OF OUR CORE
4	PROGRAMS, WHICH WAS ALREADY MENTIONED. BUT WHEN WE
5	DID THIS, WE DID THIS WITH KIND OF THE MINIMAL AND
6	NECESSARY ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PROGRAM, KNOWING THAT
7	WE WERE GOING TO COME BACK TO YOU TO MAKE MORE
8	SIGNIFICANT UPDATES LATER. AND SO THOSE
9	OPPORTUNITIES IN DISCOVERY, TRAN, AND CLIN HAVE
10	ALWAYS HAD OR HAVE SINCE BEEN MODIFIED TO CONTAIN
11	ELEMENTS THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE DESIRED OR ALIGNED
12	WITH THE STATE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE
13	PRESENT DAY.
14	SO BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO MAKE ANY
14 15	SO BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO MAKE ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS
15	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS
15 16	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH
15 16 17	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY
15 16 17 18	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WAS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE COULD
15 16 17 18 19	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WAS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE COULD DRAW ADDITIONAL INPUT AND FEEDBACK.
15 16 17 18 19	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WAS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE COULD DRAW ADDITIONAL INPUT AND FEEDBACK. ON THIS SLIDE, THEN, ARE JUST SOME OF THE
15 16 17 18 19 20	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WAS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE COULD DRAW ADDITIONAL INPUT AND FEEDBACK. ON THIS SLIDE, THEN, ARE JUST SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WE HOPE TO GET ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON IN
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WAS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE COULD DRAW ADDITIONAL INPUT AND FEEDBACK. ON THIS SLIDE, THEN, ARE JUST SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WE HOPE TO GET ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS. WE'RE NOT LOOKING FOR ANSWERS
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, WE THOUGHT THAT THOSE ITEMS DESERVE SOME CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND GUIDANCE BOTH FROM THE BOARD AS WELL AS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WAS DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE COULD DRAW ADDITIONAL INPUT AND FEEDBACK. ON THIS SLIDE, THEN, ARE JUST SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT WE HOPE TO GET ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS. WE'RE NOT LOOKING FOR ANSWERS TODAY, JUST HOPING TO PLANT THE SEED FOR WHAT KINDS

1	MOLECULE-BASED PROJECTS HAVE BEEN A SUBJECT OF
2	DISCUSSION AND DIFFERING VIEWS OVER THE YEARS OF
3	CIRM. AND MOST RECENTLY WE DIMINISHED, WITH
4	DIMINISHED FUNDS, CIRM LIMITED THE ELIGIBILITY OF
5	SMALL MOLECULE AND BIOLOGICS PROPOSALS IN FAVOR OF
6	ENSURING THAT THE REMAINING FUNDS COULD BE DEDICATED
7	TO WHAT WAS VIEWED AS OUR CORE MANDATE OF CELL
8	THERAPY AND/OR GENE THERAPY PROJECTS.
9	THERE'S OTHER ARGUMENTS THAT HAVE ALSO
10	BEEN MADE IN TERMS OF THE ROLE OF SMALL MOLECULES
11	AND CIRM'S SUPPORT FOR THEM, SUCH AS THE FACT THAT
12	THEY HAVE A MORE WELL-ESTABLISHED REGULATORY PATH
13	AND THAT THEY'RE LIKELY TO GET SOME SUPPORT FROM
14	OTHER SOURCES. SO THE UNDERLYING QUESTION IS TO
15	WHAT EXTENT SHOULD THESE KINDS OF PROJECTS BE
16	SUPPORTED ACROSS OUR PORTFOLIO?
17	SIMILARLY, WE TALKED ABOUT GENE THERAPY.
18	AND AS MENTIONED, WE STARTED FUNDING GENE THERAPY
19	PROJECTS AS A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY TWO YEARS
20	AGO. AND SO WE ALSO CREATED AS A PART OF THAT A
21	SPECIFIC DEFINITION FOR WHAT WOULD QUALIFY AS GENE
22	THERAPY. AND THE GENERAL QUESTION AND THE FEEDBACK
23	THAT WE WOULD LOOK FOR HERE IS WHETHER THE
24	DEFINITION OF GENE THERAPY IS STILL APPROPRIATE
25	AND/OR IF THE SCOPE OF GENE THERAPY SHOULD EITHER
	151

1	EXPAND OR NARROW SOMEHOW?
2	WE ALSO TALKED ABOUT THE VITAL RESEARCH
3	OPPORTUNITIES, AND THERE WE'D LIKE TO DISCUSS BOTH
4	THE PROCESS FOR DEEMING AN AREA OF RESEARCH A VITAL
5	RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. AS YOU HEARD, THOSE WOULD
6	COME TO THE BOARD IN TERMS OF DECLARING SOMETHING A
7	VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, BUT WE CAN GO INTO MORE
8	DETAIL ABOUT WHAT THAT PROCESS MIGHT LOOK LIKE, AS
9	WELL AS TO WHETHER THERE ARE SPECIFIC AREAS THAT WE
10	ARE MISSING OR NOT THINKING ABOUT THAT SHOULD BE
11	CONSIDERED A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY.
12	AND THEN, FINALLY, THERE ARE SOME
13	PROGRAMMATIC ELEMENTS THAT HAVE EXISTED WITHIN OUR
14	PROGRAMS. AND THIS IS REALLY MOSTLY A QUESTION OF
15	HOW WE ASSESS OR THE EXTENT TO WHICH WE ASSESS
16	WHETHER A PROJECT IS UNLIKELY TO RECEIVE FUNDING
17	FROM OTHER SOURCES. PROP 14, ON THE ONE HAND
18	HIGHLIGHTS THAT THIS IS A PRIORITY, YET ALSO MAKES
19	AVAILABLE THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES AS A WAY
20	TO EXPAND. SO KIND OF UNDERSTANDING WHAT THAT SCOPE
21	MIGHT LOOK LIKE, TO WHAT EXTENT THINGS SUCH AS THE
22	UNLIKELINESS OF RECEIVING FUNDS FROM OTHER SOURCES,
23	OR EVEN FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE
24	INCLUDED IN OUR ELIGIBILITY OR REVIEW CRITERIA.
25	SO THAT'S THE BACKGROUND. I'M HAPPY TO

1	TAKE ANY QUESTIONS. BACK TO DR. MILLAN.
2	DR. MILLAN: DR. SAMBRANO, THANK YOU SO
3	MUCH. AND THESE ARE MAJOR CATEGORIES THAT WE HOPE
4	TO BRING TO YOU AT THE MARCH BOARD RETREAT INFORMED
5	BY THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL IN FEBRUARY.
6	I'D LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT THE NATURE OF THIS
7	PROGRAMMATIC EVALUATION QUESTION. AS IT STANDS,
8	IT'S CURRENTLY WITHIN THE REVIEW GROUP'S KIND OF
9	RESPONSIBILITY TO INCORPORATE THIS IN HOW PROGRAMS
10	ARE REVIEWED. BUT AS I UNDERSTAND, AND DR. SAMBRANO
11	CAN ELABORATE FURTHER, IT'S BEEN ACTUALLY QUITE
12	DIFFICULT TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO MAKE THIS A REVIEW
13	AND ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA BECAUSE IT'S NOT THAT TO
14	PROVE THE PRESENCE OF A NEGATIVE IS SOMETIMES TOUGH.
15	HOW DO YOU REALLY PROVE THAT THEY COULDN'T HAVE
16	GOTTEN FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES? IT'S NOT
17	SOMETHING THAT WE MAY SOLVE TODAY, BUT I WANTED TO
18	HIGHLIGHT THE NATURE OF THAT CHALLENGE.
19	GIL, DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS TO
20	THAT?
21	DR. SAMBRANO: NO. THAT'S EXACTLY RIGHT.
22	ESPECIALLY FOR ELIGIBILITY WHERE WE WANT TO MAKE
23	OBJECTIVE DETERMINATIONS OF WHETHER SOMETHING IS,
24	YES, ELIGIBLE OR, NO, NOT ELIGIBLE. WE HAVE
25	PEPPERED IN MANY CASES ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA WITH
	153

1	THIS REQUIREMENT THAT THEY SHOW THEY'RE UNLIKELY TO
2	RECEIVE FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES, BUT IT IS
3	DIFFICULT TO ASCERTAIN CERTAINLY AT THAT LEVEL. AND
4	EVEN AT THE LEVEL OF REVIEWERS, THERE ARE CERTAINLY
5	OPINIONS ABOUT IT, BUT IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT IS
6	VERY OBJECTIVE FOR US TO TACKLE.
7	DR. MILLAN: CHAIRMAN THOMAS.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO I THINK I WANTED TO
9	ECHO MARIA'S COMMENT. I THINK FROM A BOARD
10	STANDPOINT THIS DISCUSSION IS BEST INFORMED AFTER WE
11	TAKE THESE AND OTHER QUESTIONS TO OUR SCIENTIFIC
12	ADVISORY PANEL IN FEBRUARY, BUT WOULD WELCOME IF
13	ANYBODY HAS ANY COMMENTS ON THESE PARTICULAR ISSUES
14	AT THIS POINT. ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
15	BOARD?
16	DR. VUORI: I HAVE A QUICK QUESTION. I
17	APOLOGIZE IF I HAVE LOST TRACK. COULD YOU TELL ME A
18	LITTLE MORE ABOUT THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL? IS
19	THIS NEWLY FORMED? HAS IT BEEN IN EXISTENCE FOR A
20	WHILE?
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'LL ADDRESS THAT. SO
22	AS PROP 14 ALLOWS FOR ADVISORY PANELS TO COME
23	TOGETHER, DR. MILLAN AND I HAVE PUT TOGETHER A GROUP
24	OF KOL'S FOR A LATE FEBRUARY PANEL MEETING AT WHICH
25	WE'RE GOING TO BRING A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS DEALING

1	WITH AND BEARING ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN TO THAT GROUP
2	AND WILL BE DOING IT IN THE FORM OF PRESENTATIONS BY
3	A NUMBER OF GRANTEES, WHICH PRESENTATIONS ARE GEARED
4	TOWARDS DRIVING DISCUSSION ON VERY SPECIFIC
5	QUESTIONS THAT BEAR ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN. AND SO
6	WE THINK ACTUALLY THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE
7	HAVEN'T DONE SINCE, I THINK, 2013 IS PULL TOGETHER A
8	GROUP LIKE THIS TO ASK BOTH BIG-PICTURE AND SPECIFIC
9	QUESTIONS AS TO WHAT THEY THINK OF CIRM'S
10	OPPORTUNITIES AND DIRECTION GOING FORWARD, ET
11	CETERA.
12	AND SO THESE SORTS OF ISSUES WILL BE
13	AMONGST MANY OTHERS THAT ARE RAISED AT THAT MEETING.
14	THE OUTCOME OF THAT MEETING IS SOMETHING THAT WE
15	WILL PRESENT FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION AND WILL BE
16	SOMETHING THAT INFORMS, IN PART, THE MARCH RETREAT.
17	DR. MILLAN, DO YOU WANT TO ADD TO THAT?
18	DR. MILLAN: NO. I THINK THAT THAT IS A
19	FAIR DESCRIPTION. I GUESS WE WILL DEFINITELY BRING
20	TOGETHER A SUMMARY TO THE MARCH RETREAT. AND I
21	LEAVE THAT UP TO YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS, IN TERMS OF
22	WHO ADDITIONAL YOU WOULD BE INVITING TO THE MEETING.
23	BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT WAS DONE AWHILE AGO. I
24	THINK THAT THIS MEETING THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE IN
25	FEBRUARY WILL BE VERY BROAD IN TERMS OF TOPICS. I

1	THINK THE PAST ONE REALLY RELIED ON FIGURING OUT THE
2	TRANSLATION AND CLINICAL STAGE. WHAT WE'RE TRYING
3	DRIVE AT THIS MEETING IS REALLY OPENING IT UP AND
4	MAKING SURE TO PAY DUE ATTENTION TO BASIC RESEARCH
5	AND NEURO AND CNS RESEARCH AS WELL AS ALL THE OTHER
6	TYPES OF PROGRAMS CIRM CURRENTLY FUNDS AND THE
7	FUTURE OF WHERE BASIC AND TRANSLATION RESEARCH IN
8	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IS GOING.
9	DR. VUORI: THANK YOU.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON
11	THIS SLIDE? OKAY. SO THIS ONE IS DEFINITELY TO BE
12	CONTINUED. THANK YOU. DR. MILLAN, THE NEXT
13	PRESENTATION.
14	DR. MILLAN: WE HAVE A TIME CHECK OF TWO
15	MINUTES, BUT WE DO HAVE JUST ONE FINAL PRESENTATION
16	IF IT'S OKAY.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. IF EVERYBODY CAN
18	HOLD ON FOR THAT, IT'D BE GREAT. THANK YOU.
19	DR. SAMBRANO, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR
20	PRESENTATIONS AND FOR ALL OF YOUR AND YOUR TEAM'S
21	VERY MAJOR EFFORTS TO DRIVE THE WHOLE REVIEW
22	PROCESS, WHICH IS KIND OF THE BREAD AND BUTTER THAT
23	MAKES EVERYTHING HAPPEN. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
24	THAT.
25	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU. WE HAVE A GREAT
	156
	130

1	TEAM THAT DOES IT ALL. SO APPRECIATE IT.
2	DR. MILLAN: NOW IT IS MY PLEASURE TO
3	INTRODUCE DR. KENT FITZGERALD, WHO WILL BE GIVING US
4	A VERY, VERY BROAD OVERVIEW OF OUR NEUROSCIENCE
5	PROGRAM TO DATE. DR. FITZGERALD.
6	DR. FITZGERALD: THANK YOU, DR. MILLAN,
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS, AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. NEXT
8	SLIDE PLEASE.
9	TODAY I WANTED GIVE YOU AN UPDATE AND A
10	FINAL SNAPSHOT OF THE FUNDING BREAKDOWN FOR
11	NEUROSCIENCE PROJECTS INITIATED UNDER PROP 71. YOU
12	CAN SEE IN THE TWO PIE GRAPHS BELOW WHEN WE STARTED
13	ANALYZING OUR FUNDING FOR NEURO FOR THE PURPOSES OF
14	EVALUATING OF EVOLVING THE PROGRAM TO BEST
15	LEVERAGE THE NEW PROP 14 FUNDING, WE STARTED DIGGING
16	INTO WHAT WE'VE DONE HISTORICALLY.
17	ON THE LEFT YOU CAN SEE OF THE OVERALL 753
18	PROGRAMS THAT WERE FUNDED, TOTALING A LITTLE BIT
19	OVER \$2 BILLION, APPROXIMATELY ONE-QUARTER OF THE
20	FUNDS WERE DIRECTED TOWARDS NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH,
21	WHICH IS BROKEN OUT INTO THE GRAPH ON THE RIGHT.
22	THIS RESULTS IN 173 PROJECTS TOTALING APPROXIMATELY
23	\$422 MILLION, WITH THE TOP FOUR CATEGORIES BY
24	DOLLARS INVESTED, INCLUDING ALS AND PARKINSON'S AT
25	14 PERCENT EACH, AND ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND SPINAL

1	CORD INJURY AT 10 PERCENT EACH.
2	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. FURTHER ANALYSIS OF
3	THE NEUROSCIENCE PORTFOLIO BY CATEGORIZING ALL THE
4	PROP 71 PROGRAMS INTO ADMITTEDLY BROAD PILLARS, BUT
5	THE PILLARS ARE DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND
6	CLINICAL. YOU CAN SEE IN THE GRAPH BELOW WITH
7	PILLAR COLOR-CODED BARS REPRESENTING THE DOLLARS
8	INVESTED AND THE NUMBERS OF THE PROGRAMS FOR EACH
9	FUNDED INSET WITHIN EACH BAR. AND THE WAY THIS IS
10	PRESENTED IS THE RFA'S ARE BUCKETED BY THE YEAR THAT
11	THEY BEGAN.
12	SO YOU CAN SEE WE BEGIN WITH RFA'S IN 2006
13	AND END WITH THE RFA'S WHICH BEGAN IN 2016. THESE
14	PROGRAMS ARE OBVIOUSLY ONGOING AT THIS POINT, MANY
15	OF THEM ARE.
16	SO ON THE SMALL PIE CHART YOU CAN SEE THAT
17	OVER ONE-HALF OF OUR FUNDING HAS GONE TO SUPPORT
18	WHAT WE WOULD GENERALLY CLASSIFY AS DISCOVERY
19	RESEARCH WITH CLINICAL STAGE COMING IN SECOND AND
20	TRANSLATION COMING IN THIRD PLACE. AN OBVIOUS TREND
21	THAT CAN BE SEEN HERE IS THAT THE BULK OF OUR
22	CLINICAL STAGE FUNDING REALLY HAPPENED LATER IN THE
23	LIFE SPAN OF PROP 71 FUNDING DURING THE CIRM 2.0
24	PROGRAM OFFERINGS, AND THE EARLIER CLINICAL PROGRAMS
25	BEGINNING WITH THE 2010 RFA'S WERE A SMALL NUMBER.
	150

1	THESE WERE PROGRAMS IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE,
2	HUNTINGTON'S, ALS, AND SPINAL CORD INJURY. AND
3	THESE SUPPORTED NONCLINICAL TRIAL PROGRAMS THAT WERE
4	IND-ENABLING WORK. SO NOT A LARGE NUMBER OF
5	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE PROGRAMS WERE SEEKING CIRM
6	FUNDING AT THAT TIME, WHICH RAISES SOME QUESTIONS ON
7	WHY THAT MIGHT BE.
8	WE DID HAVE ONE EXAMPLE OF CONTINUED
9	DEVELOPMENT OF ONE OF THESE EARLY PROGRAMS FROM THE
10	2010 RFA, WHICH WAS CLIVE SVENDSEN'S ALS PROGRAM
11	WHICH LATER CAME BACK IN OUR 2.0 ITERATION FOR
12	CLINICAL TRIAL FUNDING.
13	SO FEW OTHER QUESTIONS WE'D LIKE TO ASK OF
14	THIS DATASET AND, ADMITTEDLY, THIS IS A HIGHLY
15	SIMPLIFIED VERSION OF THE DATA THAT WE HAVE. WE
16	HAVE A NUMBER OF PARAMETERS FOR EACH ONE OF THE
17	PROGRAMS THAT ARE INDICATED HERE. BUT DID THIS
18	LARGE NUMBER OF DISCOVERY PROGRAMS THAT WE FUNDED
19	EARLY ON, CAN THOSE FORM THE BASIS FOR A PIPELINE
20	THAT CIRM SHOULD CONTINUE TO ADVANCE? AND IF SO,
21	HOW WOULD WE WANT TO DO THAT? THIS CAN BE ADDRESSED
22	PARTIALLY BY DETERMINING WHERE THESE PROGRAMS ENDED
23	UP AFTER COMPLETION OF CIRM FUNDING. AND SOME
24	GENERAL PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS HAS ALREADY SHOWN THAT
25	THE APPEARANCE OF THE NEUROCLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS

1	AND TRANSLATIONAL STAGE PROGRAMS IN OUR 2.0 PHASE
2	MAY REFLECT THE MATURATION OF THE FIELD AS A WHOLE,
3	WHERE A LOT OF THIS FOUNDATIONAL DEVELOPMENT WAS
4	STARTING TO MATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT READY
5	CANDIDATES.
6	WE INTEND TO CONTINUE TO LEVERAGE THIS
7	DATASET, WHICH YOU WILL SEE LIKELY IN THE SAP
8	MEETING THAT IS UPCOMING TO IDENTIFY GAPS THAT COULD
9	BE ADDRESSED WITH OUR PROP 14 FUNDS AND BRING THESE
10	CONCEPTS TO THE BOARD. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
11	BACK IN 2019 WE STARTED CONSIDERING HOW WE
12	COULD BEST EVOLVE OUR NEUROSCIENCE STRATEGY. IN
13	APRIL 2019 WE HOSTED A BRAINSTORMING MEETING
14	CREATIVELY TITLED "CIRM BRAINSTORMING
15	NEURODEGENERATION." THIS WAS A TWO-DAY WORKSHOP
16	WITH 50 INVITED PARTICIPANTS REPRESENTING KEY
17	OPINION LEADERS REPRESENTING STEM CELL R&D, DISEASE
18	FOUNDATIONS, ACADEMIA, INDUSTRY, FUNDING BODIES, AND
19	THE FDA. AND THE GOAL OF THIS MEETING WAS TO TACKLE
20	ISSUES SPECIFIC TO NEURODEGENERATIVE THERAPY
21	DEVELOPMENT USING STATE-OF-THE-ART SCIENCE AND TO
22	RECONFIGURE DISCOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT PIPELINES TO
23	FIND SYNERGIES WITHIN GROUPS AND CONSORTIA. NEXT
24	SLIDE PLEASE.
25	SO THE OVERALL THEMES THAT WERE DISCUSSED
	100

1	DURING THIS MEETING INCLUDED HOT TOPICS LIKE
2	LEVERAGING GENOMICS AND BIG DATA, THE USE OF IPSC
3	MODELS AND CREATING STANDARDS IN UTILIZING IPS
4	BANKS. EXPLORING A NEURODEGENERATION CONSORTIUM
5	MODEL. SO, AS YOU KNOW, OUR PROGRAMS HAVE OPERATED
6	HISTORICALLY INDEPENDENT OF EACH OTHER. WAS THERE
7	AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A CONSORTIUM-BASED MODEL TO HELP
8	ENHANCE PROGRESS IN THE FIELD? ACCELERATING DRUG
9	DEVELOPMENT BASED ON PATIENT DATA, THE OPPORTUNITY
10	FOR IMPLEMENTING THINGS LIKE PLATFORM TRIALS IN
11	NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
12	TRIALS, CLINICAL TRIALS IN A REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
13	SPACE, AND BENEFITS OF A CONSORTIUM, TAKING
14	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE NEURODEGENERATIVE CANDIDATES
15	TO THE CLINIC.
16	AND AFTER WE HAD THIS DISCUSSION, WE HAD
17	SMALL BREAKOUT GROUPS THAT WERE DESIGNED TO DISCUSS
18	WHERE IS THE VALUE IN A CONSORTIUM, AND WHAT THINGS
19	WOULD BE NEEDED TO HAVE AN EFFECTIVE CONSORTIUM IN
20	THIS SPACE? AND THE MEETING WRAPPED UP WITH A PANEL
21	DISCUSSION DISCUSSING WOULD A CONSORTIUM-BASED
22	APPROACH ACCELERATE THERAPY DEVELOPMENT, AND HOW
23	WOULD WE IMPLEMENT THAT. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
24	SO SOME HIGH LEVEL MAJOR NEEDS THAT WERE
25	IDENTIFIED ARE SHOWN HERE AS THEMATIC OUTCOMES.

1	INITIALLY THERE WAS A CLEAR NEED FOR STANDARDIZATION
2	AND RESEARCH TOOLS, MODEL SYSTEMS, AND DATA
3	COLLECTION IN ORDER TO HAVE COMPARABLE RESEARCH
4	ACROSS THE FIELD. A CLEAR NEED FOR DATA SHARING,
5	WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT WE ARE CURRENTLY DISCUSSING
6	AND IMPLEMENTING IN THE CURRENT ACTIVE RFA'S THAT WE
7	HAVE. DATA SHARING CAN TAKE THE FORM OF
8	DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE ACROSS THE FIELD, BUT,
9	IMPORTANTLY, THE GROUP IDENTIFIED THE INCLUSION OF
10	FAILURE ANALYSIS TO HELP ADVANCE BREAKTHROUGH
11	SCIENCE, AND THAT THE DATA NEEDS TO BE SPECIFIC TO
12	THE END USER'S NEEDS. DATASET EXPANSION IN TERMS OF
13	ENRICHING DATA AVAILABLE FROM CLINICAL TRIALS,
14	INCLUDING NON-DISEASE BASED CONTROLS IN BLUE-CARD
15	OUTLIERS TO HELP INCREASE THE POWER OF THE RESULTS
16	THAT CAME FROM THOSE TRIALS.
17	GAPS IS SOMETHING YOU'VE BEEN DISCUSSING A
18	LOT TODAY, THE GAPS IN TRAINING, SPECIFICALLY
19	PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL RESEARCHERS, AND THE NEED FOR
20	WORKFORCE EXPANSION, AND THE USE OF A
21	CROSS-DISCIPLINE STRUCTURE WITH CLINICIANS AND BASIC
22	SCIENTISTS PARTNERING TOGETHER. ADDITIONAL
23	CONSORTIA ELEMENTS THAT WERE IDENTIFIED AS BEING
24	IMPORTANT IS LEVERAGING THE POSITIVE ASPECTS OF A
25	LARGE NUMBER OF CONSORTIA. WE GENERATED A DATABASE

1	OF CONSORTIA ACROSS NEURODEGENERATION WITH ELEMENTS
2	OF EACH OF THOSE, AND THE PLUSES AND MINUSES TO EACH
3	OF THOSE ELEMENTS, AND HOW WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO
4	LEVERAGE THOSE ELEMENTS IN THE FORMATION OF A NEW
5	EFFORT, IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC GAPS TO BE
6	FILLED. AND ONE MAJOR OUTCOME WAS THAT THE
7	CONSORTIA, IN ORDER TO BE SUCCESSFUL, NEEDS TO HAVE
8	CLEAR AND ARTICULATE GOALS, BUT AT THE SAME TIME
9	HAVE THE ABILITY FOR DIRECTED EVOLUTION, AND
10	ULTIMATELY TIME-BOUND DELIVERABLES AND END GOALS
11	NEED TO BE IN PLACE IN ORDER TO DRIVE TOWARDS
12	SUCCESS.
13	THE CONSORTIA COULD TAKE THE FORM OF
14	BROAD, DISEASE-FOCUSED COMMON MECHANISMS, THINGS
15	ALONG THOSE LINES; HOWEVER, A SPECIFIC
16	INFRASTRUCTURE TO EACH WOULD NEED TO BE BUILT TO
17	SUIT THE NEEDS OF THE CONSORTIUM.
18	AND, FINALLY, THE NEED FOR AN UNBIASED
19	ORGANIZER TO COORDINATE EFFORTS WITHIN ANY
20	LARGE-SCALE EFFORT LIKE THIS WITH A CONSORTIA
21	SERVING AS A RESOURCE AGGREGATOR. AND, OF COURSE,
22	THIS COMES ALONG WITH MANY OPERATIONAL ASPECTS.
23	WE HAVE A PUBLISHED SUMMARY OF THE MEETING
24	WHICH GOES INTO MUCH MORE DETAIL THAN WHAT I
25	DESCRIBED AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE AS WELL AS THE

1	DETAILED PROGRAM AND MANY OF THE PRESENTATIONS THAT
2	WERE GIVEN AT THE MEETING. WITH THAT, I'LL FINISH.
3	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, KENT.
4	SEEMS LIKE WE HAD THAT WORKSHOP JUST YESTERDAY AND
5	NOW THE OUTPUT OF THAT WORKSHOP IS GOING TO BE
6	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT AS WE CONTINUE THE DISCUSSIONS
7	BOTH AT THE ADVISORY PANEL AND AT THE MARCH BOARD
8	RETREAT AS WE LOOK FOR POTENTIAL AVENUES IN
9	ACCELERATING CNS RESEARCH UNDER PROP 14.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS, I'M TURNING IT BACK TO
11	YOU.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU,
13	DR. FITZGERALD, FOR THAT PRESENTATION. VERY, VERY
14	INFORMATIVE. I THINK, AS DR. MILLAN SUGGESTS, THIS
15	MAY BE A TOPIC THAT'S BEST TAKEN UP IN MORE DETAIL
16	IN THE MARCH RETREAT, BUT ARE THERE ANY IMMEDIATE
17	THOUGHTS ON THESE SLIDES AT THIS POINT FROM MEMBERS
18	OF THE BOARD?
19	DR. YAMAMOTO: JUST A QUICK COMMENT, J.T.
20	AND THAT IS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE LEARNED
21	FROM THE PANDEMIC IS THAT SELF-ASSEMBLED TEAMS,
22	CONSORTIA, COMING FROM VERY DIFFERENT AREAS OF
23	EXPERTISE THAT AGGREGATE AROUND A PROBLEM OF COMMON
24	INTEREST CAN HAVE TREMENDOUS POWER IN TERMS OF BEING
25	ABLE TO UNCOVER CRITICAL INFORMATION IN A SHORT

1	AMOUNT OF TIME WHEN THE TEAM MEMBERS REALLY FEEL
2	THAT THEY ARE REALLY OPERATING AS A UNIT AND THAT
3	THEIR OWN SEPARATE EGO DRIVERS ARE SET ASIDE BECAUSE
4	THERE'S REALLY A CLEAR VIEW ON THE PART OF EVERYONE
5	IN THE GROUP OF WHAT THE END POINT GOAL IS.
6	I AGREE THAT THIS APPROACH, FORMING
7	EFFECTIVE CONSORTIA, CAN BE VERY POWERFUL. AND I
8	THINK THAT IF CIRM CAN HELP TO MOTIVATE THAT
9	EFFECTIVELY IN THIS AREA AND OTHERS, THAT IT WILL,
10	AGAIN, BE AN AREA WHERE THIS ORGANIZATION KIND OF
11	STEPS OUT AND SAYS THIS IS SOMETHING THAT CAN REALLY
12	MOVE SCIENCE IN MUCH MORE EFFECTIVE, RAPID WAYS AND
13	THAT IT'S SOMETHING THAT WE SHOULD REALLY STAND
14	BEHIND AND STAND FOR.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. YAMAMOTO.
16	OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
17	DR. HIGGINS: QUICK COMMENT AND COULD I
18	ACTUALLY ASK A QUICK QUESTION?
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE.
20	DR. HIGGINS: THIS IS A QUESTION FOR
21	EITHER KENT OR MARIA, AND IT'S PROBABLY AN UNFAIR
22	QUESTION, BUT IT MIGHT GET US THINKING. IF YOU HAD
23	KNOWN IN APRIL OF 2019 THAT YOU WERE GOING TO HAVE
24	\$1.5 BILLION DEDICATED TO THIS AREA OF RESEARCH OR
25	DEVELOPMENT, WOULD YOU HAVE DONE THINGS DIFFERENTLY

1	WHEN YOU HAVE DIFFERENT INFORMATION TODAY?
2	DR. MILLAN: SO, DR. HIGGINS, WHEN WE HAD
3	THAT WORKSHOP, WE HAD AN EYE TOWARD THIS TIME
4	BECAUSE AT THAT TIME WE ALREADY WERE KIND OF NOT IN
5	A WIND-DOWN PHASE, BUT WE KNEW THAT WE HAD LIMITED
6	FUNDS FOR WHAT WE COULD DO. BUT WE ALSO SAW THAT
7	THE OPPORTUNITIES WERE THERE THAT WE NEEDED TO THINK
8	ON A GO-FORWARD BASIS. AND IF WE HAD NOT BEEN
9	REFUNDED, WE WERE LOOKING FOR OPPORTUNITIES FOR OUR
10	FUNDED RESEARCHERS TO MAKE THE MOST OUT OF THE
11	RESEARCH WE DID FUND. SO WE ACTUALLY HAD AN EYE
12	TOWARD A FUTURE STRATEGY WHEN WE ASSEMBLED THE
13	MEETING.
14	A LOT OF THOUGHT WENT IT ACTUALLY WAS A
	A LOT OF THOUGHT WENT IT ACTUALLY WAS A COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY
15	
15 16	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY
15 16 17	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN
15 16 17 18	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP
15 16 17 18 19	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THAT GROUP, BUT HE WASN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THAT GROUP, BUT HE WASN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE MEETING, BUT HE ATTENDED. AND DR. RILEY, WHO IS
15 16 17 18 19	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THAT GROUP, BUT HE WASN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE MEETING, BUT HE ATTENDED. AND DR. RILEY, WHO IS THE OTHER EXECUTIVE ON THAT RUNNING THAT PROGRAM,
15 16 17 18 19 20	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THAT GROUP, BUT HE WASN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE MEETING, BUT HE ATTENDED. AND DR. RILEY, WHO IS THE OTHER EXECUTIVE ON THAT RUNNING THAT PROGRAM, WAS THERE, MICHAEL J. FOX FOUNDATION, A VARIETY OF
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THAT GROUP, BUT HE WASN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE MEETING, BUT HE ATTENDED. AND DR. RILEY, WHO IS THE OTHER EXECUTIVE ON THAT RUNNING THAT PROGRAM, WAS THERE, MICHAEL J. FOX FOUNDATION, A VARIETY OF NEURODEGENERATION FOUNDATIONS' LEADERSHIP IN VARIOUS
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COLLABORATION BETWEEN WHAT'S CALLED NOW CURRENTLY THE ASAP GROUP THAT WAS FUNDED BY THE SERGEY BRIN FUND. DR. RANDY SCHEKMAN IS ONE OF THE LEADERSHIP IN THAT GROUP, BUT HE WASN'T DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE MEETING, BUT HE ATTENDED. AND DR. RILEY, WHO IS THE OTHER EXECUTIVE ON THAT RUNNING THAT PROGRAM, WAS THERE, MICHAEL J. FOX FOUNDATION, A VARIETY OF NEURODEGENERATION FOUNDATIONS' LEADERSHIP IN VARIOUS SECTORS, NINDS, AND THERE WAS A GREAT AMOUNT OF

1	THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE THIS HAPPEN.
2	BUT THEN WE ALSO DRILLED DOWN ON THE
3	REALITIES AND THE GAPS AND THE CHALLENGES. SO WE
4	WERE ALREADY KIND OF GATHERING INFORMATION, BEING
5	VERY OPTIMISTIC THAT WE WOULD HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE
6	FIELD IN ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.
7	DR. VUORI: ALONG THE SAME LINES, MARIA
8	AND KENT, I WAS WONDERING THIS IS GREAT OBVIOUSLY
9	FOR THE NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASES. HAVE YOU
10	CONSIDERED SOMETHING SIMILAR FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
11	DISORDERS? WOULD THAT BE AN AREA OF OPPORTUNITY AS
12	WELL?
13	DR. MILLAN: WE DIDN'T SPECIFICALLY
14	DISCUSS THAT AT THIS MEETING, BUT THE IDEA BEHIND A
15	CONSORTIA MODEL IS SOMETHING WE'RE ENVISIONING FOR
16	OUR SCIENTIFIC STRATEGY FOR CIRM IN GENERAL. AT THE
17	LAST MEETING, I PUT UP A SCHEMATIC OF HOW WE'VE
18	ALREADY HAD SOME PILOTS IN THIS, THE CURE SICKLE
19	CELL INITIATIVE, SOME OF HOW WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO
20	LEVERAGE OUR INVESTMENT IN THE GENOMICS PROGRAM WITH
21	PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE CHEN-ZUCKERBERG INITIATIVE.
22	WE SEE THAT CIRM ALREADY IS A CONSORTIUM, AND THE
23	QUESTION IS HOW DO WE THEN CREATE THESE SPECIALIZED
24	CONSORTIA THAT ARE FIT FOR A PURPOSE IN ADDRESSING
25	MAJOR HURDLES. AND SOME OF THE HURDLES ARE, AS DR.

1	YAMAMOTO POINTED OUT, ARE HOW WE ORGANIZE OURSELVES
2	AND HOW EFFECTIVELY THE DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS ARE
3	ACTUALLY WORKING TOGETHER ON THIS.
4	IT'S SOMETHING THAT I THINK THE SCIENTIFIC
5	COMMUNITY HAS ACKNOWLEDGED AS SOMETHING VERY
6	IMPORTANT. AND I THINK WITH WHAT WE ARE FACING
7	TODAY WITH PROP 14 WITH THIS EARMARK FOR
8	NEURODEGENERATIVE TOWARDS CNS DISORDERS, I THINK
9	IT'S A HUGE OPPORTUNITY, BUT IT COULD ALSO BE
10	APPLIED FOR OTHER.
11	IN THIS MEETING WE SPECIFICALLY WORKED ON
12	NEURODEGENERATION, BUT THAT'S A PROGRAMMATIC TOPIC
13	THAT WE SHOULD ALSO DISCUSS AND LIKE TO GET INPUT ON
14	FROM THE BOARD TO DETERMINE WHETHER WE CAN LOOK AT
15	OUR PROGRAM OFFERINGS AND, IF THE BOARD GIVES
16	DIRECTION, THAT WE SHOULD MAKE SURE THAT THAT IS
17	SOMETHING THAT WE BRING INTO OUR PORTFOLIO. THEN WE
18	WILL WE HAVE THE STRUCTURE AND MECHANISMS TO DO
19	THAT.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS OR
21	QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY. DR.
22	FITZGERALD, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR ALL YOUR WORK ON
23	THIS. THIS IS OBVIOUSLY GOING TO BE A VERY
24	FRONT-AND-CENTER TOPIC GOING FORWARD. SO WE LOOK
25	FORWARD TO HEARING MORE AND TO BOARD DISCUSSION ON
	100

1	THIS IN MARCH.
2	DR. MILLAN, DOES THAT CONCLUDE THE
3	PRESENTATIONS?
4	DR. MILLAN: THAT CONCLUDES OUR
5	PRESENTATIONS. GEOFF, IF YOU WOULDN'T MIND GOING TO
6	THE NEXT SLIDE.
7	SO AS YOU CAN SEE, WE COVERED THE AREAS
8	HERE: CNS RESEARCH, EDUCATION, SCOPE, SHARED LABS,
9	ALPHA CLINICS, COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS, AND THE
10	FUTURE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SPECIALIZED TRACKS
11	ALL PART OF EDUCATION. THESE ARE ALL COVERED EITHER
12	AS TANGIBLE POTENTIAL CONCEPTS THAT WILL BE BROUGHT
13	TO YOU OR CONCEPTS THAT ARE IN DEVELOPMENT OR NEW
14	PROGRAMS THAT WILL BE BROUGHT IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN.
15	JUST WANTED TO GIVE THAT KIND OF BROAD OVERVIEW,
16	THAT THIS IS HOW THE PROPOSITION 14 COMPONENTS ARE
17	BEING KIND OF PUT INTO ACTION AT VARIOUS STAGES.
18	THANK YOU.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. MILLAN.
20	THANK YOU, THE ENTIRE TEAM, FOR THE SERIES OF VERY
21	INFORMATIVE PRESENTATIONS. I THINK THEY'RE GREAT
22	FOOD FOR THOUGHT. AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING
23	THESE DISCUSSIONS WHEN WE GET TO THE MARCH SESSION.
24	THAT GETS US THROUGH THIS PORTION OF THE
25	VERY MEATY PORTION OF THE AGENDA HERE. I THINK IT'S

1	BEEN A VERY PRODUCTIVE ONE IN DEALING WITH THE
2	ELEMENTS OF PROP 14 AND THE SPECIFICS OF DIFFERENT
3	SORTS OF PROGRAMS THAT ARE BEING CONTEMPLATED BY DR.
4	MILLAN AND THE TEAM. THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR ALL
5	THE WORK THAT WENT INTO PUTTING THIS TOGETHER, AND
6	MORE ON THIS DOWN THE ROAD.
7	WE ARE NOW INTO PUBLIC COMMENT. I HAVE
8	ONE I'M GOING TO READ FROM DR. TREVOR CARDINAL, WHO
9	IS A PROFESSOR OF BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING AT CAL POLY
10	SAN LUIS OBISPO. THE GENERAL TOPIC IS BRIDGES. AND
11	THIS IS HIS COMMENT:
12	"MEMBERS OF THE ICOC, THANK YOU FOR YOUR
13	TIME AND EFFORTS TO ADVANCE THE FIELD OF
14	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO
15	DELIVER A PUBLIC COMMENT.
16	"MY NAME IS TREVOR CARDINAL. I'M A
17	PROFESSOR OF BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING AT CAL POLY SAN
18	LUIS OBISPO AND THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR ON A CIRM
19	BRIDGES 2 AWARD.
20	"AS YOU MAY BE AWARE, MANY OF THE BRIDGES
21	2 AWARDS ARE EXPIRING IN THE SUMMER OF 2021. WITH
22	THE PASSAGE OF PROP 14, OUR TEAM LOOKS FORWARD TO
23	COMPETING FOR A FUTURE BRIDGES AWARD UNDER A NEW
24	RFA. HOWEVER, IN THE MEANTIME WE HOPE TO ADMIT OUR
25	NEXT COHORT OF STUDENTS IN FEBRUARY AND MARCH OF
	4-0

1	THIS YEAR IN ADVANCE OF A FALL 2021 MATRICULATION.
2	THEREFORE, I REQUEST THAT THE BOARD CONSIDER A
3	ONE-YEAR NONCOMPETITIVE RENEWAL OF THE BRIDGES 2
4	AWARD. THIS ONE-YEAR RENEWAL WOULD ALLOW US TO
5	BRIDGE OUR CURRENT BRIDGES PROGRAM TO THE NEXT RFA
6	AS WAS DONE BETWEEN THE EXPIRATION OF THE FIRST
7	BRIDGES RFA AND THE RFA FOR BRIDGES 2 IN 2015.
8	"THE ABSENCE OF SUCH A GAP FUNDING
9	FOLLOWING THE EXPIRATION OF THE BRIDGES 2 AWARDS MAY
10	FORCE THE BRIDGES PROGRAM SUCH AS OURS TO SUSPEND
11	OPERATIONS UNTIL THE 2022-23 ACADEMIC YEAR. SUCH AN
12	INTERRUPTION WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR ABILITY TO
13	TRAIN OUR STUDENTS FOR THE RAPIDLY GROWING
14	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE INDUSTRY.
15	"THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION."
16	DR. MILLAN, DO WE HAVE ANY THOUGHTS ON
17	THAT, NOT THAT WE NEED TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC COMMENT,
18	BUT I JUST WONDERED IF YOU ARE WHAT YOU WOULD SAY
19	ABOUT THAT ONE.
20	DR. MILLAN: I THINK THAT THAT IS
21	SOMETHING THAT THE BOARD CAN CONSIDER. WE REALLY DO
22	HOPE THAT WE'LL BE ABLE TO GET A FORMAL PROGRAM WITH
23	ALL OF THE WELL-CONSIDERED ELEMENTS THAT WE THINK
24	WILL MAKE THE BRIDGES PROGRAM RELAUNCH ONE THAT'S
25	BUILT TO LAST AND BUILT TO SUPPORT WHAT WE ENVISION

1	IS IMPORTANT FOR THE UPCOMING YEARS, AT LEAST FIVE
2	YEARS. SO I THINK THAT AN EXTENSION, OF COURSE,
3	WOULD JUST MEAN THAT THEY WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE
4	TERMS OF THE PREVIOUS AWARD. AND I'M NOT SURE KIND
5	OF WHAT TYPE OF REVIEW PROCESS THAT WOULD GO
6	THROUGH. I ASSUME THAT IT WOULD BE PURELY A BOARD
7	DECISION, BUT I DEFER TO YOU ON THAT.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I KNOW THIS IS A LITTLE
9	UNORTHODOX TO HAVE BOARD DISCUSSION FOLLOWING A
10	PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS ON THAT
11	PARTICULAR PUBLIC COMMENT?
12	DR. VUORI: I WAS WONDERING IF FOR THE
13	NEXT BOARD MEETING, I THINK IN FEBRUARY, THE CIRM
14	STAFF COULD MAKE A PROPOSAL WHAT FINANCIALLY AND
15	OTHERWISE THAT TYPE OF AN EXTENSION WOULD LOOK LIKE.
16	AND I GUESS THE ICOC COULD THEN CONSIDER THAT.
17	DR. MARTIN: I WOULD ALSO ASK THE QUESTION
18	ARE WE SETTING A PRECEDENT THAT WE CAN MANAGE?
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU BOTH. DR.
20	MILLAN, COULD YOU PERHAPS RESPOND TO BOTH OF THOSE
21	COMMENTS?
22	DR. MILLAN: I THINK THEY'RE BOTH FAIR
23	CONSIDERATIONS. I THINK BRINGING FORWARD WHAT THE
24	FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THAT OR WHAT THE BUDGETARY
25	REQUIREMENTS WOULD BE FOR THAT IS SOMETHING WE CAN

1	EASILY DO AND WOULD BE ABLE TO PROVIDE TO THE BOARD.
2	BUT THE SECOND POINT OF WHAT DOES THAT DO
3	IN TERMS OF PRECEDENT, I THINK THAT THAT IS A
4	CONSIDERATION AS WELL, AND ALSO THAT WILL IMPACT
5	DOWNSTREAM WHAT WE DO WITH THE PROGRAMS THAT HAD THE
6	EXTENSION VERSUS THOSE THAT DIDN'T HAVE THE
7	EXTENSION AND HOW THESE INTERPLAY INTO THE
8	REQUIREMENTS WE HAVE OF NEWLY LAUNCHED PROGRAMS
9	VERSUS NOT.
10	SO I THINK THOSE ARE THINGS THAT THE BOARD
11	WOULD WANT TO CONSIDER REGARDING THE STANDARDS OF
12	OUR PROGRAMS.
13	AND THEN THE SECOND POINT ON PRECEDENT, I
14	THINK THERE IS A HUGE AMOUNT OF ENTHUSIASM, WHICH IS
15	GREAT, FOR OUR FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES; BUT I THINK
16	ONE OF THE CONCERNS IS THAT THOSE WHO MAY BE UNDER
17	SOME LEGACY FUNDING OR FUNDING FROM RESIDUAL GRANTS
18	THEN MAY WANT MAY FEEL THAT THE NEWLY LAUNCHED
19	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES HAVE MORE FAVORABLE OPTIONS
20	AND FEATURES, AND THEY'D WANT TO HAVE THE OPTION TO
21	JUMP TO THAT. AND I THINK THAT THAT COULD PROVIDE A
22	VERY CHALLENGING SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES IF WE WERE TO
23	CONSIDER THOSE FOR OUR TEAM AS WELL AS, AGAIN,
24	BRINGING UP THE IDEA OF PROCESS AND STANDARDS FOR
25	HOW WE OPERATE.

1	SO THAT'S JUST BUT WE WILL ABSOLUTELY
2	TAKE UP WHATEVER THE BOARD DIRECTS US TO DO AND
3	CONSIDER. THANK YOU.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER
5	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS
6	PARTICULAR
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: I WAS JUST GOING TO SAY
8	WE HAVE MORE PUBLIC COMMENT WHEN YOU'RE READY, J.T.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. I JUST
10	WANTED TO GET THROUGH THIS AND SEE IF THERE'S
11	ANYBODY ELSE WHO HAD A THOUGHT. OKAY. YES, MARIA,
12	PLEASE, OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: I WOULD ASK THE CALLER TO
14	UNMUTE HIMSELF OR HERSELF, AND THEN YOU CAN GO AHEAD
15	WITH PUBLIC COMMENT. YOUR HAND IS RAISED.
16	MR. STUART: HI. CHAIRMAN THOMAS AND
17	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, MY NAME IS JAMES STUART. AND
18	I'M A PERSON LIVING WITH MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS, AND A
19	PATIENT ADVOCATE. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU CAN
20	HEAR ME.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES, WE CAN.
22	MR. STUART: PERFECT. SO I HAD A COMMENT
23	TO MAKE REGARDING THE PROPOSITION, JAMES HARRISON'S
24	PROP 14 PRESENTATION, WHICH SUMMARIZES THE WORDING
25	IN SECTION 3(B) OF THE APPROVED INITIATIVE THAT

1	AUTHORIZES \$1.5 BILLION AND DEDICATES THAT TO
2	DISEASES AND CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN AND CENTRAL
3	NERVOUS SYSTEM. KIND OF REWINDING BACK, YOU SHOWED
4	SLIDE 9, AND IN RED THERE WAS THE SECTION THAT TALKS
5	ABOUT IDENTIFYING DISEASES AND CONDITIONS SUCH AS
6	ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE, PARKINSON'S DISEASE, ET CETERA.
7	BUT THE SLIDE DOES NOT ALSO INCLUDE WHAT THE BILL
8	INCLUDES WHICH IS IT REFERS TO OTHER DISEASES AND
9	CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN, WHICH I BELIEVE GENERALLY
10	INCLUDES THE DISEASE DESCRIBED AS MULTIPLE
11	SCLEROSIS.
12	SO I'D LIKE TO REQUEST THE BOARD TO
13	INCLUDE EITHER THE WORDS "MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS" OR
14	INCLUDE OTHER DISEASES AND CONDITIONS OF THE BRAIN
15	SO THAT WHEN THE 1.5 BILLION TARGET IS ALLOCATED, IT
16	INCLUDES THAT AREA OF NEURORESEARCH THAT IS SO
17	IMPORTANT TO ME AND OTHERS IN CALIFORNIA THAT ARE
18	LIVING WITH MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS. THANK YOU.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THAT WILL
20	DEFINITELY BE INCLUDED. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
21	YOUR COMMENTS. NEXT, MARIA.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: THAT'S IT.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THAT
24	CONCLUDES. SO JUST IN CLOSING, LIKE TO THANK MARIA
25	BONNEVILLE AND DOUG GUILLEN FOR ALL THEIR HARD WORK

1	IN, AS ALWAYS, MAKING THIS MEETING HAPPEN, FOR
2	EVERYTHING THEY DO.
3	I DID WANT TO CLOSE, AS I'VE NOTED TO YOU
4	FROM TIME TO TIME, IN THE MIDDLE OF MEETINGS, MARIA
5	SENDS ME TEXTS WHICH ARE VERY HELPFUL IN SORT OF
6	GUIDING HOW THINGS ARE GOING. AND UNDER THE HEADING
7	OF, JUST WHEN YOU THINK YOU'VE HEARD EVERYTHING, SHE
8	SENT ME ONE TODAY IN THE MIDDLE OF THE TEXT WHICH
9	SAYS, AND I QUOTE, "IS YOUR DOG IN THERE? I THINK
10	WE CAN HEAR HIM BREATHING," TO WHICH I SORT OF WAS
11	WONDERING WHAT THE RELEVANCE OF THAT WAS. IN FACT,
12	HE WASN'T IN THERE, BUT HAD HE BEEN, I WAS WONDERING
13	IF, MARIA, YOU WERE SUGGESTING I ASK HIM TO STOP.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE WAS JUST SOME
15	FEEDBACK, AND WE THOUGHT IT WAS COMING FROM YOU, AND
16	IT SOUNDED LIKE YOUR DOG SNORTING. I WAS JUST
17	CURIOUS.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU FOR KEEPING ME
19	ON MY TOES AS USUAL.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: NO PROBLEM. HAPPY TO DO
21	IT.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, THANK YOU. SO WITH
23	THAT, THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR WHAT I HOPE WE ALL
24	VIEWED AS A VERY PRODUCTIVE MEETING. AND JUST
25	EVERYBODY PLEASE KEEP SAFE AND HEALTHY, AND WE LOOK

1	FORWARD TO SEEING YOU IN FEBRUARY. MARIA, WHAT IS
2	OUR DATE FOR THAT?
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: I WAS GOING TO CUT IN AND
4	MENTION IT TO EVERYONE. WE'LL BE SENDING OUT THE
5	DATES FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE BOARD MEETINGS THIS
6	YEAR. THERE'S A LOT OF THEM. AS YOU KNOW, THERE'S
7	A MONTHLY APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEN
8	THERE WILL BE FOUR MORE IN-PERSON BOARD MEETINGS,
9	NOT IN PERSON, FULL BOARD MEETINGS. I'M SO USED TO
10	SAYING IN-PERSON BOARD MEETINGS EVEN THOUGH IT'S
11	BEEN OVER A YEAR.
12	THE NEXT MEETING IS FEBRUARY 25TH, AND
13	THAT IS A FULL BOARD MEETING. AND THEN WHAT WE'RE
14	CALLING THE RETREAT WILL BE MARCH 23D, AND THAT WAS
15	BASED ON A DOODLE POLL THAT GOT SENT OUT AND
16	RESPONSES AS TO WHEN THE MOST BOARD MEMBERS WERE
17	AVAILABLE. WE'LL SEND OUT THE ENTIRE CALENDAR.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
19	AND WITH THAT, WE STAND ADJOURNED.
20	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
21	1:30 P.M.)
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 PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 28, 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, CA CSR 7152 133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO (208) 920-3543

178