	BEFORE THE
APPLICA CALIFORNIA INS ORGA	EFORE THE IZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND THE ATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE TITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ANIZED PURSUANT TO THE FEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
	REGULAR MEETING
LOCATION:	VIA ZOOM
DATE:	DECEMBER 15, 2022 9 A.M.
REPORTER:	BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR CSR. NO. 7152
FILE NO.:	2022-51

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	4
2. ROLL CALL	5
<pre>3. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT'S</pre>	6
CONSENT CALENDAR	22
4. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 27 ICOC/ARS MEETING	
5. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO CIRM BUSINESS MEETING POLICY	
6. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO CIRM DONATIONS/GIFT POLICY	
7. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO CIRM TRAVEL POLICY	
8. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP	
ACTION ITEMS	
9. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1 OR 2)	-
10. CONSIDERATION OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP	50
11. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO SHARED RESOURCE LABS CONCEPT PLAN	57
12. CONSIDERATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY FOR THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILI WORKING GROUP	
2	

INDEX (CONT'D.)

CLOSED SESSION

88

NONE

13. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM 9 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)).

14. DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 11126, SUBDIVISION (A); HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 125290.30(F) (3) (D)) COMPENSATION FOR CIRM CEO/PRESIDENT

ACTION ITEMS

15.	CONSIDERATION	OF	COMPENSATION	FOR	88
CIRM	CEO/PRESIDENT				

DISCUSSION ITEMS

16.	UPDATES	FROM	THE	ACCESSIBILITY	AND	92
AFFO	RDABILIT	Y WORK	ING	GROUP		

17. GENERAL COMMENTS ON ARS PROCESS108

18. PUBLIC COMMENT

19. ADJOURNMENT 109

3

	·
1	THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2022; 9 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY,
4	AND WELCOME TO THE DECEMBER 15, 2022, MEETING OF THE
5	ICOC. THIS IS A FULL MEETING OF THE BOARD.
6	APPRECIATE EVERYBODY BEING HERE FOR THIS MEETING AS
7	ALWAYS.
8	MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
10	MOHAMMAD ABOUSALEM.
11	DR. ABOUSALEM: PRESENT.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
13	DR. BARRETT: PRESENT.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
15	MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
17	DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN. LINDA
19	BOXER.
20	DR. BOXER: PRESENT.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
22	CLARK-HARVEY.
23	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: PRESENT.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
25	DR. DEAS: HERE.
	4
	4

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
2	YSABEL DURON.	MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
3	DR.	FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
4	MS.	BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
5	DR.	FISHER: PRESENT.
6	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
7	DR.	FLOWERS: HERE.
8	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
9	DR.	GASSON: HERE.
10	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
11	DR.	GOLDSTEIN: HERE.
12	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
13	DR.	HIGGINS: HERE.
14	MS.	BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
15	MR.	JUELSGAARD: PRESENT.
16	MS.	BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. PAT LEVITT.
17	DR.	LEVITT: HERE.
18	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
19	DR.	MALKAS: HERE.
20	MS.	BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
21	DR.	MELMED: HERE.
22	MS.	BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
23	LAUREN MILLER	-ROGEN. I THINK I SAW LAUREN.
24	MS.	MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
25	MS.	BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. ADRIANA
		5
		ر

1	PADILLA.
2	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
4	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
6	MR. ROWLETT: HERE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
8	DR. SELICK: HERE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
10	DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS. JONATHAN
12	THOMAS.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
15	MR. TORRES: PRESENT.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
17	THANK YOU. J.T.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
19	GO FIRST HERE TO THE CHAIR'S REPORT.
20	WANTED TO GIVE EVERYBODY AN UPDATE OF WHERE WE ARE
21	ON THE SEARCH FOR THE NEW CHAIR. SO AS YOU RECALL,
22	WE HAD ORIGINALLY CALENDARED TO HAVE TODAY AS THE
23	DAY WE WERE TO CONSIDER THE ELECTION OF OUR NEW
24	CHAIR. AS A HAPPENS, ONE OF OUR TWO CANDIDATES,
25	JOHN PEREZ, MADE THE DECISION TO WITHDRAW FROM
	6
	5

1	CONSIDERATION A COUPLE WEEKS BACK AND NOTIFIED THE
2	GOVERNOR, WHO HAD BEEN HIS NOMINATOR FOR THAT, OF
3	THAT DECISION, AT WHICH POINT THE GOVERNOR NOMINATED
4	DR. VITO IMBASCIANI AS HIS NEW NOMINEE.
5	YOU ALL HAVE RECEIVED HIS INFORMATION IN
6	THE FORM OF HIS LETTER OF INTEREST FOR THE POSITION
7	AS WELL AS HIS CV. HE NOW WILL JOIN DR. EMILY
8	MARCUS, WHO IS OUR OTHER CANDIDATE, ON THE SLATE FOR
9	CONSIDERATION.
10	AND TO GIVE DR. IMBASCIANI TIME TO GET
11	INTO THE PROCESS ADEQUATELY, I IMMEDIATELY SHIFTED
12	GEARS AND MOVED THE ELECTION TO OUR JANUARY 26TH
13	BOARD MEETING. AS YOU RECALL, THAT ELECTION IS TO
14	BE PRECEDED BY A MEETING OF THE GOVERNANCE
15	SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE SAME SUBJECT. AND THAT WILL
16	BE DO WE HAVE A DATE FOR THAT, MARIA, AT THIS
17	POINT, DO YOU KNOW, OR MARIANNE?
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. IT'S JANUARY 26TH.
19	AND WE ARE HOPING THAT AS MANY MEMBERS CAN JOIN.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE.
21	SORRY.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: OH, GOVERNANCE. SORRY.
23	I THINK IT IS THE 13TH.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: IS THAT CORRECT,
	7

1	MARIANNE?
2	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YES.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. GREAT. THANK
4	YOU.
5	SO AS YOU MAY RECALL, THE PROCESS IS GOING
6	TO BE, FOR THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE, EACH
7	CANDIDATE IN TURN AND IN CLOSED SESSION WILL READ AN
8	OPENING STATEMENT, IF YOU WILL, FOLLOWED BY AN
9	INTERVIEW AND Q AND A WITH THE GOVERNANCE
10	SUBCOMMITTEE. THAT SUBCOMMITTEE WILL NOT BE MAKING
11	A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD. IT WILL PASS BOTH
12	CANDIDATES FOR CONSIDERATION TO THE BOARD. AND AT
13	THE BOARD MEETING, IT WILL BE A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT
14	PROCESS. IT WILL BEGIN WITH EACH CANDIDATE READING
15	THEIR OPENING STATEMENT IN PUBLIC SESSION AND THEN
16	GOING IN IN SEQUENCE TO CLOSED SESSION FOR THE SAME
17	PROCESS OF DISCUSSION, Q AND A, ET CETERA, AT WHICH
18	POINT THE CLOSED SESSION WILL END, THE BOARD WILL
19	RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION, AND THERE WILL BE A VOTE.
20	AND THE NEW CHAIR WILL BE SELECTED AT THAT POINT.
21	SO THAT'S GOING TO BE THE PROCESS. SO
22	THANK YOU FOR YOUR FLEXIBILITY ON THAT. AS IT
23	HAPPENS, BECAUSE THE JANUARY 26TH MEETING IS GOING
24	TO BE IN PERSON, OUR FIRST ONE IN BASICALLY THREE
25	YEARS, FIRST OF ALL, HOPE WE GET AS MUCH ATTENDANCE

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

8

1	AS POSSIBLE. IT WILL BE GREAT TO SEE EVERYBODY LIVE
2	AS OPPOSED TO ON ZOOM ALL THIS TIME, NOT THAT YOU
3	DON'T LOOK GREAT ON ZOOM, OF COURSE, BUT BE EVEN
4	BETTER TO SEE EVERYONE IN PERSON, AND IT WILL GIVE
5	THE CANDIDATES AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE FACE-TO-FACE
6	DISCUSSION WHICH, AS WE ALL AGREE, IS PREFERABLE TO
7	HAVING THAT SORT OF THING BE OVER ZOOM. SO PLEASE
8	DO PUT THAT ON YOUR CALENDAR, AND WE HOPE TO SEE YOU
9	ON JANUARY 26TH. SO THAT IS THE PROCESS FOR THAT.
10	MY OTHER TOPIC IS, OF COURSE, A VERY,
11	VERY, VERY SAD ONE, WHICH IS, AS I NOTIFIED THE
12	BOARD A COUPLE DAYS AGO, WE LOST OUR BELOVED
13	DIRECTOR OF PATIENT ADVOCACY, KEVIN MCCORMACK, TO A
14	HEART ATTACK ON SUNDAY EVENING. THIS IS SOMETHING
15	THAT WE'VE BEEN HAVING A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFICULTY
16	COMING TO GRIPS WITH AS AN ORGANIZATION AND HAVE HAD
17	A LOT OF DISCUSSION ABOUT KEVIN. WE HAVE
18	HAD MARIA MILLAN HAS ARRANGED FOR GRIEF
19	COUNSELING FOR THE CIRM TEAM FOR EVERYBODY SORT OF
20	TRYING TO PROCESS THIS TERRIBLE NEWS IN THEIR OWN
21	WAY, BUT THAT'S SOMETHING THAT HAS BEEN MADE
22	AVAILABLE TO HELP US DO THAT.
23	KEVIN, AS I SAID IN MY NOTE TO ALL OF YOU,
24	I SO REMEMBER WHEN WE WERE LOOKING FOR A DIRECTOR OF
25	COMMUNICATIONS TEN YEARS AGO, AND HE CAME INTO MY
	9

1	OFFICE AND WAS KEVIN, AS WE ALL KNOW HIM, WHICH IS
2	INFECTIOUSLY ENTHUSIASTIC, THE SUNNIEST, AND MOST
3	OPTIMISTIC OF DISPOSITIONS, EXPRESSED VERY CLEAR
4	INTEREST IN CIRM'S MISSION. COULD NOT HAVE BEEN
5	MORE INTERESTED IN PATIENT WELL-BEING AND HAD A
6	KINDNESS TO HIM THAT SORT OF PERVADED EVERYTHING
7	ELSE. AND SO WE HIRED KEVIN AT THAT POINT.
8	HE'S BEEN THE PRINCIPAL DRIVER OF CIRM'S
9	MESSAGE TO THE OUTSIDE WORLD FOR ALL THESE YEARS.
10	HE, I THINK, UNFAILINGLY, EVERYBODY WHO KNEW HIM,
11	CAME INTO TOUCH WITH HIM WAS ALWAYS THE BETTER FOR
12	THAT INTERACTION. HE JUST MADE EVERYBODY FEEL LIKE
13	HE WAS TALKING TO THEM, SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THEM.
14	AND IN SO DOING, NOT ONLY MADE THEM FEEL LIKE THEY
15	WERE THE CENTER OF ATTENTION THAT THEY DESERVED TO
16	BE, BUT WAS A TREMENDOUS AMBASSADOR FOR CIRM IN
17	SPREADING OUR MESSAGE AND REALLY WAS THE BEST OF
18	WHAT WE DO. HE WAS JUST A CONSUMMATE PROFESSIONAL
19	AND APPROACHED IT WITH SUCH GRACE AND DIGNITY AND
20	SINCERE INTEREST, AND HE JUST LEAVES HIS PASSING
21	LEAVES AN ENORMOUS VOID FOR US, AND IT'S SOMETHING
22	THAT WE WILL NEVER FORGET.
23	SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS TO OPEN THIS UP
24	TO COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. OBVIOUSLY WE
25	HAVE BEEN IN GREAT COMMUNICATION WITH HIS WIFE
	10

1	SHIRLEY, FOR WHOM WE FEEL TERRIBLE, AND ARE TRYING
2	TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO HELP. IT'S JUST A VERY,
3	VERY TOUGH TIME, AND I WOULD APPRECIATE, IF SOME
4	BOARD MEMBERS WOULD PLEASE LIKE TO SHARE
5	REMEMBRANCES OF KEVIN, THIS WOULD BE A GOOD TIME TO
6	DO IT. SO, ART, I KNOW YOU WANTED TO START THINGS
7	OFF IF YOU COULD OPEN HERE PLEASE.
8	MR. TORRES: YES. I FIRST MET KEVIN YEARS
9	AGO WHEN WE WERE WORKING TOGETHER TO HELP BUILD THE
10	NEW HOSPITAL FOR CPMC ON VAN NESS, WHICH IS NOW IN
11	EXISTENCE AND QUITE A MONUMENT TO HEALTHCARE. AND
12	DURING THAT PERIOD OF TIME, WE WORKED ON
13	COMMUNICATIONS AND ALSO WORKING ON PATIENT ADVOCACY
14	FOR THAT HOSPITAL AND FOR THE PEOPLE AND STAFF
15	AROUND THAT HOSPITAL. AND I ALWAYS REMEMBER THOSE
16	EARLY TIMES.
17	BUT I ALSO REMEMBER OUR RELATIONSHIP AS AN
18	IRISH MAN AND A MEXICAN-AMERICAN MAN. FEW PEOPLE
19	REMEMBER THAT THERE WAS A GREAT LOS SAN PATRICIO
20	BATTALION OF IRISH SOLDIERS THAT CAME TO THE DEFENSE
21	OF THE MEXICAN REVOLUTIONARY FORCES AGAINST THE
22	OMNIPRESENT POWERS IN MEXICO. IT WAS THE IRISH WHO
23	REALLY PROVIDED TREMENDOUS SUPPORT FOR THE
24	REVOLUTIONARIES IN MEXICO DURING THAT PERIOD OF
25	TIME. SO WE ALSO HELD A SPECIAL BOND. IN FACT,

1	THERE'S A UNIT THAT'S STILL IN EXISTENCE OF
2	ANCESTORS OF LOS SAN PATRICIO BATTALION IN MARIN
3	COUNTY OF ALL PLACES. AND SO KEVIN AND I WOULD
4	ALWAYS TALK ABOUT THAT AND ALWAYS TALK ABOUT HIS
5	WIFE AND HIS FAMILY.
6	AND HE WAS VERY CLOSE TO MY SON, JOAQUIN,
7	AS WELL. AND SO FOR ME IT WAS SHOCKING, AND IT TORE
8	MY HEART APART. SO TO KEVIN. MAY THE ROAD COME TO
9	MEET YOU, MAY THE WIND BE ALWAYS AT YOUR BACK, MAY
10	THE SUN SHINE AND WARM UPON YOUR FACE, RAINS FALL
11	SOFTLY UPON YOUR FIELDS. AND UNTIL WE MEET AGAIN,
12	MAY GOD HOLD YOU IN THE HOLLOW OF HIS HAND. GOD
13	BLESS YOU, MY FRIEND.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ART. THAT
15	WAS BEAUTIFUL. MARK.
16	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. I CAN'T MATCH
17	THE ELOQUENCE OF THE STATEMENTS REFLECTING KEVIN. I
18	CAN ONLY GIVE A TINY SNAPSHOT OF MY INTERACTIONS
19	WITH HIM OVER THE YEARS, MANY YEARS. AND I DIDN'T
20	HAVE EXTENSIVE INTERACTIONS WITH CIRM; BUT WITHOUT A
21	DOUBT, EVERY INTERACTION WITH KEVIN WAS EXACTLY AS
22	DESCRIBED IN TERMS OF THE FOCUS, THE GENUINE DESIRE
23	TO HEAR AND LISTEN, THE FOLLOW-UP COMMUNICATIONS,
24	THE GRACE OF HIS INCREDIBLY DIFFICULT SCHEDULE, AND
25	AT THE SAME TIME DEALING WITH A LOT OF DIFFERENT

1	INDIVIDUALS I JUST FOUND EXTRAORDINARY AND JUST WAY
2	BEYOND WHAT I'VE RUN ACROSS WITH RESPECT TO FOLKS
3	THAT ARE IN SIMILAR SETS OF CIRCUMSTANCES. SO JUST
4	UNBELIEVABLY GENEROUS WITH HIS TIME AND HIS THOUGHTS
5	AND HIS EXECUTION AND HIS FOLLOW-UP WITH REALLY GOOD
6	IDEAS AND THOUGHTS. AND THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT
7	WE'RE GOING TO MISS HIM A LOT. YEAH. JUST WANTED
8	TO BE ABLE TO SHARE THOSE THOUGHTS.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARK. JOE.
10	MR. PANETTA: THANKS, J.T. AND AS MARK
11	SAID, IT'S DIFFICULT TO MATCH THE ELOQUENCE WITH
12	WHICH ART TALKED ABOUT KEVIN.
13	I'VE BEEN ON THE BOARD FOR A LONG TIME
14	AND, OF COURSE, HAD THE EXPERIENCE OF WORKING
15	DIRECTLY WITH KEVIN AS A BOARD MEMBER. BUT I WANT
16	EVERYONE TO KNOW HOW IMPORTANT KEVIN WAS TO US AT
17	THE ORGANIZATION THAT I RUN, BIOCOM CALIFORNIA,
18	WHICH IS THE LIFE SCIENCE ASSOCIATION FOR THE
19	INDUSTRY AND RESEARCH HERE IN CALIFORNIA AND ALSO TO
20	ENSURE THAT PRODUCTS GET TO PATIENTS JUST AS IS THE
21	MISSION OF CIRM.
22	WE'VE GOT A COMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT AT
23	BIOCOM THAT WORKED VERY CLOSELY WITH KEVIN OVER THE
24	YEARS. AND NOT ONLY WAS I DEVASTATED, BUT WHEN I
25	MENTIONED TO JULIE AMES, OUR VP OF COMMUNICATIONS,
	13

1	THAT WE HAD LOST KEVIN, SHE WAS SADDENED AND
2	DEVASTATED, AND SHE SAID TWO THINGS. SUCH AN
3	INCREDIBLE, CONSUMMATE, PASSIONATE PROFESSIONAL AND
4	JUST SUCH A NICE PERSON TO WORK WITH. SO WE'RE
5	GOING TO MISS KEVIN AT BIOCOM CALIFORNIA.
6	BUT TO ADD TO ART'S COMMENTS ON KEVIN AS
7	AN IRISHMAN, RIGHT AFTER I JOINED CIRM, MY WIFE, WHO
8	IS IRISH, PERSUADED ME TO TAKE OUR FIRST TRIP TO
9	IRELAND. AND NEVER HAVING BEEN TO IRELAND, I TURNED
10	TO KEVIN AND I SAID THIS IS WHAT WE ARE PLANNING TO
11	DO. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A TRIP TO DUBLIN AND GALWAY
12	AND AROUND THE SOUTHERN PART OF IRELAND. KEVIN AND
13	I MUST HAVE SPENT AN HOUR ON THE PHONE. HE WAS MY
14	TOUR GUIDE AND TOLD US EVERYWHERE WE SHOULD GO,
15	EVERY PUB IN DUBLIN, AND EVERYTHING ELSE THAT WE
16	SHOULD SEE WHILE WE WERE THERE. AND I APPRECIATED
17	THAT SO MUCH, AND I'LL NEVER FORGET THAT AND HIS
18	ENTHUSIASM ABOUT IT AND JUST THE FACT THAT WE HAD
19	SUCH A GREAT TIME BASED ON KEVIN'S RECOMMENDATIONS
20	IN LARGE PART TOO.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JOE.
22	ANNE-MARIE.
23	DR. DULIEGE: SO TO ADD TO THAT, I WOULD
24	SAY THAT KEVIN LIFTED US UP. HE WAS MAKING US
25	BETTER PEOPLE, MORE ENTHUSIASTIC, MORE OPTIMISTIC,
	14

1	MORE ENERGETIC IN GENERAL JUST BY HIS MERE PRESENCE
2	AND HIS SMILE AND HIS KINDNESS. AND, YES, INDEED,
3	ON TOP OF EVERYTHING WE SAID, HE WENT BEYOND THE
4	CALL OF DUTY. AND THAT WAS JUST HIM.
5	SO, JOE, THE EXAMPLE YOU MENTIONED IS SO
6	TELLING. AND I WOULD SAY IN MY CASE I HAD DAUGHTERS
7	IN HIGH SCHOOL IN JOURNALISM CLASS. AND ONCE I
8	ASKED HIM IF HE WANTED TO GIVE A PRESENTATION ABOUT
9	WHAT HE WAS DOING AT CIRM IN MEDICAL JOURNALISM.
10	AND ABSOLUTELY HE CAME TO PALO ALTO AND GAVE I
11	CAN IMAGINE HIM TALKING TO TEENAGERS, AND HE WAS AS
12	ELOQUENT AND INSPIRING AS HE WAS WHEN HE WAS TALKING
13	TO PATIENTS, ACTIVISTS, OR US AT CIRM AND ICOC. SO
14	THAT WAS VERY MUCH HIM.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.
16	DAVID.
17	DR. HIGGINS: I THINK KEVIN BROKE ALL THE
18	RULES. YOU WOULD THINK OF KEVIN AS A CONSUMMATE
19	PROFESSIONAL WHO COULD REPRESENT WITHIN MINUTES OF A
20	BOARD DECISION THE BOARD ACTIVITY. BUT ALSO AS A
21	HUMAN BEING, HE WAS AN INCREDIBLE GUY. WE ALL KNOW
22	THAT. BUT WHAT I THINK MAYBE IS MISSING FROM
23	KNOWING KEVIN, UNLESS YOU KNOW KEVIN WELL, IS THAT
24	HE NEVER DREW A LINE BETWEEN THOSE TWO. THAT SOUNDS
25	LIKE THAT WOULD BE UNPROFESSIONAL, BUT IT'S NOT. HE

1	WAS THE SAME SUPPORTIVE PATIENT ADVOCATE AT THE END
2	OF THE BAR HAVING AN IRISH BEER AS HE WAS. HE DID
3	NOT SEPARATE THOSE TWO. THOSE WERE TWO ROLES OF ONE
4	PERSON.
5	AND I THINK HE EXEMPLIFIES HOW WE ALL
6	SHOULD BE PROFESSIONAL, OF COURSE, BUT ALSO BE HUMAN
7	AT THE SAME TIME.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WELL SAID.
9	DAN.
10	MR. BERNAL: YEAH. I HAVE TO SAY KEVIN IS
11	ONE OF THE FIRST PEOPLE THAT WE INTERACT WITH WHEN
12	WE BECOME A BOARD MEMBER. AND I FIRST MET HIM MANY
13	YEARS AGO WHEN HE USED TO WORK WITH CPMC WHEN WE DID
14	AN EVENT WITH THE CHILD HEALTHCARE CENTER. BUT THE
15	WAY THAT HE WAS SO WELCOMING AND ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT
16	ALL OF OUR STEPPING UP TO SERVE ON THE ICOC. AND
17	THE WAY HE WROTE TOO WITH JUST SUCH VIGOR AND
18	ENTHUSIASM WAS REALLY IN SOME WAYS REALLY JOYFUL.
19	SO CERTAINLY WANT TO POINT OUT HIS ROLE AND REALLY
20	KIND OF BRINGING US IN AND SOCIALIZING US INTO THE
21	ORGANIZATION AND ITS CULTURE. HE AND MARIA WERE SO
22	GREAT IN REALLY BRINGING US ON BOARD AND HELPING US
23	FEEL WELCOME AND REALLY ELEVATING OUR OWN SENSE OF
24	WHAT WE COULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE ORGANIZATION AND HOW
25	HE WOULD WRITE ABOUT OUR JOINING THE BOARD.

16

1	SO IT WAS REALLY JUST A JOY TO WORK WITH
2	HIM WHEN I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY. SO HE'LL BE VERY
3	SORELY MISSED.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAN. AL.
5	MR. ROWLETT: I'D BE REMISS IF I DIDN'T
6	RECALL AN EXPERIENCE WITH KEVIN WHERE HE WAS ASKED
7	TO CONTRIBUTE TO A STORY. AND BEING NEW TO CIRM AND
8	NOT KNOWING WHAT THE PARTICULARS WERE, I ASKED
9	KEVIN. AND HE ENTHUSIASTICALLY WALKED ME THROUGH
10	EVERY PARTICULAR SCENARIO THAT YOU WOULD IMAGINE.
11	AND THEN AFTERWARDS SAID, "AND DON'T HESITATE TO
12	CALL ME DURING THE INTERVIEW IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS."
13	AND THAT KIND OF ENTHUSIASM AND THAT KIND OF
14	COMMITMENT TO THE ORGANIZATION, HE WAS CONSCIENTIOUS
15	ABOUT CIRM AND CARED ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION VERY
16	MUCH. AND IT DEMONSTRATED CARING FOR ME AS I WAS
17	BEING ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION AS A
18	RELATIVELY NEW BOARD MEMBER AT THE TIME.
19	AND I RECALL SAYING SOMETHING TO HIM
20	ABOUT, NOT ONLY WAS I PREPARED, I WAS OVERPREPARED
21	AND HOW MUCH I APPRECIATED HIS WORK IN THAT AREA.
22	HE WILL BE MISSED AS, AGAIN, THE CONSUMMATE
23	PROFESSIONAL.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. FRED.
25	DR. FISHER: THIS IS SO INTERESTING
	17

1	BECAUSE I ONLY HAD ONE KIND OF EXPERIENCE WITH
2	KEVIN. AND THAT WAS AS A PERSON WHO WAS
3	ENTHUSIASTIC AND PASSIONATE ABOUT ALS, THAT WHEN WE
4	ENGAGED CIRM, LONG BEFORE I WAS A BOARD MEMBER, IT
5	WAS ALWAYS ABOUT ALS. AND MOSTLY IT WAS BETWEEN HIM
6	AND MY COMMUNICATIONS STAFFER. AND THEY HAD THIS
7	AMAZING RELATIONSHIP THAT MADE US FEEL REALLY
8	SPECIAL. KEVIN HAD NO CONNECTION TO ALS. HIS
9	CONNECTION WAS TO CIRM AND THE MISSION OF CIRM.
10	AND IT SEEMS TO ME FROM LISTENING TO THIS
11	TODAY, THAT HE MADE EVERYBODY FEEL SPECIAL ABOUT
12	WHAT THEY DID, WHO THEY WERE, WHAT THEIR MISSION
13	WAS, AND HE ADOPTED AS HIS OWN BECAUSE THAT WAS SO
14	MUCH IN ALIGNMENT WITH WHAT CIRM IS ABOUT. AND SO
15	AS A COMMUNICATIONS PERSON, HE DID KIND OF AN
16	AMAZING JOB OF COMMUNICATING JUST HOW IMPORTANT AND
17	VALUABLE WE WERE. HIS RESPONSIVENESS REALLY IS WHAT
18	TOLD US THAT. AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IN THE
19	CONTEXT OF THIS CONVERSATION, HE DID HIS JOB REALLY
20	WELL BECAUSE IN REALITY WE WEREN'T SPECIAL AT ALL.
21	WE WERE JUST ONE OF THE MANY PIECES OF THE CIRM
22	PUZZLE, AND HE LIKELY MADE EVERY SINGLE ONE OF US
23	FEEL SPECIAL ABOUT WHO WERE, WHAT WE WERE DOING, AND
24	OUR CONNECTION TO CIRM. AND I THINK THAT'S AN
25	AMAZING ABILITY THAT WILL BE VERY HARD TO FOLLOW IN

18

1	HIS FOOTSTEPS, BUT SETS A VERY HIGH BAR GOING
2	FORWARD.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. ALSO
4	VERY WELL SAID. JUDY.
5	DR. GASSON: I JUST HAVE A COUPLE THINGS
6	TO ADD TO EVERYTHING THAT'S BEEN SAID, AND OBVIOUSLY
7	I AGREE WITH ALL THAT'S BEEN SAID AND THE WARMTH AND
8	THE GREAT INTERACTIONS THAT WE ALL HAD. OVER THE
9	LAST YEAR, I'VE HAD MORE INTERACTION WITH KEVIN THAN
10	I HAD PREVIOUSLY. AND I JUST WANTED TO ADD TO THE
11	QUALITIES THAT WE'VE BEEN CELEBRATING AND WILL
12	CONTINUE TO CELEBRATE, HIS UNBELIEVABLE SENSE OF
13	HUMOR. HE HAD TO BE ONE OF THE MOST HILARIOUS
14	PEOPLE I'VE EVER INTERACTED WITH. AND IT WAS ALWAYS
15	VERY PROFESSIONAL, AND IT WAS ALWAYS VERY
16	APPROPRIATE, BUT HE WAS SO QUICK AND SO FUNNY AND SO
17	DELIGHTFUL TO DEAL WITH.
18	THE LAST TWO E-MAILS I GOT FROM HIM WERE
19	ADDRESSED, "DEAR LOVELY PEOPLE," WHICH I THOUGHT WAS
20	JUST A REMARKABLE WAY THAT KEVIN INTERACTED WITH ALL
21	OF US. THANK YOU.
22	MR. TORRES: BEAUTIFUL. BEAUTIFUL, JUDY.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JUDY.
24	YSABEL.
25	MS. DURON: THANKS, MR. CHAIR. IT'S VERY
	19

1	HARD FOR ME TO TALK ABOUT KEVIN BECAUSE WE ACTUALLY
2	WORKED TOGETHER FOR MANY YEARS AT CAREON. AND HE
3	WAS THE PRODUCER OF MY AWARDING SERIES ON MY OWN
4	CANCER EXPERIENCE. I'VE ALWAYS HAD A REALLY
5	CLOSE-KNIT RELATIONSHIP WITH KEVIN AND SO WAS VERY
6	THRILLED WHEN I CAME A BOARD CIRM, UNKNOWING HE WAS
7	HERE, TO BE ABLE TO COME BACK AND WORK WITH HIM.
8	WHEN I HEARD ABOUT THE NEWS, MY FIRST
9	THOUGHT IS WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO WITHOUT HIM. I
10	PARTICULARLY APPRECIATED HIM BECAUSE HE WAS
11	ALWAYS HE WAS ALWAYS THE, IN SOME WAYS, THE WINGS
12	BENEATH THE WIND BENEATH MY WINGS, TELLING ME AND
13	HELPING ME AND REMINDING ME WHAT WE WERE DOING, WHY
14	WE WERE DOING IT, AND WHAT WAS GOOD ABOUT WHAT WE
15	WERE DOING. AND SO I'M REALLY, REALLY GOING TO MISS
16	HIM. HE WAS, I THINK, AS JUDY SAID, EVERYBODY SAID,
17	HE WAS A JOY TO BE AROUND. AND I'M GOING TO MISS
18	THAT ACCENT, GOING TO MISS THAT BROGUE, GOING TO
19	MISS I'M GOING TO MISS HIM A LOT, AND I PROBABLY
20	CAN'T EVEN BEGIN TO COUNT THE WAYS AT THIS TIME.
21	THANK YOU.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL. AND
23	THANK YOU, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. I THINK THIS HAS
24	BEEN A WONDERFUL TRIBUTE TO KEVIN. I SHOULD JUST
25	SAY THAT IN MY CAPACITY AS THE DESIGNATED MAJOR

20

1	SPORTS FAN OF THE BOARD, ONE OF MY LAST EXCHANGES
2	WAS POINTING OUT TO KEVIN HOW THE U.S. ACTUALLY
3	OUTPLAYED ENGLAND IN THE WORLD CUP MATCH, WHICH, OF
4	COURSE, HE TOOK GREAT EXCEPTION TO AND POINTED OUT
5	THAT THEY FARED BETTER LATER ON THAN WE DID.
6	SO I JUST WANT TO END WITH SOMETHING JUDY
7	SAID, WHICH I THINK JUST EXQUISITELY CAPTURED KEVIN,
8	WHICH WAS THAT HE DID REFER TO ALL OF US AS LOVELY
9	PEOPLE. AND THAT WAS AN EXPRESSION HE USED THAT WAS
10	JUST VERY FITTING OF HIS LIFE VIEW AND HOW HE
11	ENGAGED WITH US AND EVERYBODY IN A SPECIAL WAY. AND
12	I WANTED TO POINT OUT TO THE BOARD THAT A GREAT
13	MEMBER OF OUR COMMUNICATIONS, KATIE SHARIFY, HAS
14	TAKEN UP THAT EXPRESSION IN HER E-MAILS AS WELL,
15	WHICH I THINK IS WE DIDN'T KNOW AT THE TIME, BUT
16	WILL BE A WONDERFUL ONGOING TRIBUTE TO KEVIN. SO,
17	KATIE, I THINK YOU'RE LISTENING, WE WILL NEVER BE
18	ABLE TO SEE THAT EXPRESSION WITHOUT BEING REMINDED
19	OF KEVIN, WHICH IS A WONDERFUL THING. SO THANK YOU,
20	EVERYBODY, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, FOR THIS VERY
21	MOVING TRIBUTE.
22	OKAY. WE ARE GOING TO MOVE ON NEXT TO THE
23	CONSENT CALENDAR AND
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., MICHAEL HAS HIS
25	HAND RAISED.
	21

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'M SORRY. MICHAEL,
2	YES, SIR.
3	DR. STAMOS: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
4	SORRY I DIDN'T GET A CHANCE TO EVER MEET KEVIN IN
5	PERSON, SO I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD. BUT
6	OBVIOUSLY A BIG LOSS.
7	BUT I HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE PREVIOUS
8	CONVERSATION ABOUT THE ICOC MEETING ON JANUARY 26TH.
9	AND IRONICALLY I WAS ALSO ENCOURAGING US TO MEET IN
10	PERSON. I CAN'T MAKE IT BECAUSE OF PRIOR
11	COMMITMENTS IN PERSON BUT BACK HERE IN TOWN. I
12	THINK THAT WILL STILL GIVE ME FULL CAPACITY TO BE
13	INVOLVED AND TO VOTE, ET CETERA; IS THAT CORRECT? I
14	WILL BE AVAILABLE DURING THAT TIME. I JUST CAN'T BE
15	THERE ON-SITE.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. FOR THOSE
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. IT WILL BE A HYBRID
18	MEETING.
19	DR. STAMOS: I'M SORRY ABOUT THAT. I WILL
20	MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO MAKE THE FUTURE MEETINGS WHICH
21	I THINK ARE NOW ON THE BOOKS FOR LATER IN THE YEAR,
22	BUT THANK YOU.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OKAY. WE
24	HAVE FIVE ITEMS ON THE CONSENT AGENDA. ARE THERE
25	ANY ITEMS ANYBODY WANTS REMOVED AT THIS POINT?
	22

1	OTHERWISE WE WILL TAKE THEM EN BANC FOR
2	CONSIDERATION. IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE
3	CONSENT CALENDAR?
4	MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.
5	DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. MOVED BY
7	ART, SECONDED BY MARV. MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL
8	THE ROLL.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE NEED PUBLIC COMMENT.
10	WE DON'T NEED IT, BUT WE SHOULD ASK FOR IT.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S A GOOD POINT,
12	YES. ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON THESE TOPICS?
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: I KNOW THIS WILL BE
14	CRAZY. NO HANDS RAISED.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WELL, THAT'S JUST
16	THE WAY IT IS. OKAY. MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL
17	THE ROLL.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
19	MOHAMMAD ABOUSALEM.
20	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
22	DR. BARRETT: AYE.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
24	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
	23

		•
1	DR. BLUMENTH	AL: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN. LINDA
3	BOXER.	
4	DR. BOXER:	YES.
5	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
6	CLARK-HARVEY.	
7	DR. CLARK-HA	RVEY: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: DEBORAH DEAS.
9	DR. DEAS: Y	ES.
10	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
11	DR. DULIEGE:	YES.
12	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: YSABEL DURON.
13	MS. DURON:	YES.
14	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
15	DR. FISCHER-	COLBRIE: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: FRED FISHER.
17	DR. FISHER:	YES.
18	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: ELENA FLOWERS.
19	DR. FLOWERS:	YES.
20	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: JUDY GASSON.
21	DR. GASSON:	YES.
22	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
23	DR. GOLDSTEI	N: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVIL	LE: DAVID HIGGINS.
25	DR. HIGGINS:	YES.
		24
		۲ <u>۲</u>

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
2	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. PAT LEVITT.
4	DR. LEVITT: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
6	DR. MALKAS: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
8	DR. MELMED: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
10	LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
11	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
13	DR. PADILLA: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
15	MR. PANETTA: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
17	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
19	DR. SELICK: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
21	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
23	DR. STAMOS: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
	25

	•
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
2	MR. TORRES: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
4	MOTION CARRIES.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. OKAY.
6	WE'RE GOING TO GO NOW INTO THE APPLICATION REVIEW
7	SUBCOMMITTEE PORTION OF THE MEETING FOR ITEM 9,
8	CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE
9	TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM
10	ANNOUNCEMENT CLIN1 OR 2. PRESENTATION BY DR.
11	SAMBRANO.
12	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU MR. CHAIRMAN. SO
13	GOOD MORNING, ALL.
14	TODAY I'M GOING TO PRESENT THE
15	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LATEST CYCLE OF OUR CLIN
16	OPPORTUNITY. AS WE ALWAYS DO, WE WANT TO REMIND
17	EVERYBODY ABOUT OUR MISSION AND WHY WE DO WHAT WE DO
18	IS ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER
19	TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN
20	AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND
21	WORLD.
22	THIS IS A REMINDER OF THE STATUS OF OUR
23	CLINICAL BUDGET. WE HAVE AN ALLOCATION OF 169
24	MILLION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR, AND THIS FAR THE BOARD
25	HAS APPROVED ABOUT 55 MILLION IN AWARDS. THE TOTAL
	26

1	AMOUNT REQUESTED TODAY FROM FOUR APPLICATIONS TOTALS
2	ABOUT 29 MILLION. AND IF THOSE ARE APPROVED, WE
3	WOULD BE RIGHT ABOUT HALFWAY IN TERMS OF THE BUDGET
4	ON THE 169 MILLION FOR THIS YEAR, AND WE ARE RIGHT
5	AT THE MIDDLE OF THE YEAR. SO WE ARE RIGHT ON
6	TARGET.
7	THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING SYSTEM THAT WE USE
8	OR THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP USES TO SCORE
9	APPLICATIONS IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAM IS ON A SCALE
10	OF 1, 2, OR 3. A SCORE OF 1 MEANS THAT AN
11	APPLICATION HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS
12	FUNDING. A SCORE OF 2 MEANS THAT THE APPLICANT WILL
13	GET A SUMMARY OF CONCERNS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT,
14	AND THOSE EASILY WILL GO BACK TO THE GWG BEFORE THEY
15	COME TO THE BOARD, IF THEY EVER DO. AND THEN A
16	SCORE OF 3 IS FOR APPLICATIONS THAT ARE SUFFICIENTLY
17	FLAWED THAT THEY WOULD NOT WARRANT FUNDING, AND WE
18	DON'T ALLOW RESUBMISSION FOR AT LEAST SIX MONTHS.
19	THEY GO BACK AND RETHINK THE PROJECT.
20	THE REVIEW CRITERIA THAT THE SCORE IS
21	BASED ON ARE THE FOLLOWING FIVE QUESTIONS. DOES THE
22	PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND
23	POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? MEANING WHAT VALUE DOES IT
24	OFFER AND IS THIS SOMETHING THAT ULTIMATELY IS WORTH
25	DOING AND IS GOING TO IMPACT PATIENTS. IS THE
	~ ~

27

1	RATIONALE SOUND? IS THE PROJECT WELL-PLANNED AND
2	DESIGNED? AND IS IT FEASIBLE, INCLUDING WHETHER
3	THEY HAVE THE APPROPRIATE RESOURCES AND THE TEAM
4	PERSONNEL TO CARRY IT OUT? AND LASTLY, DOES THE
5	PROJECT UPHOLD THE PRINCIPLES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY,
6	AND INCLUSION?
7	THE COMPOSITION OF THE GRANTS WORKING
8	GROUP THAT REVIEWS THESE APPLICATIONS INCLUDES THE
9	SCIENTIFIC GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS THAT ARE ALL
10	OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA, AND THEY PROVIDE THE
11	SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION. AND WE BRING EXPERTS FROM A
12	VARIETY OF PERSPECTIVES TO THE TABLE, INCLUDING
13	DISEASE AREA EXPERTS THAT ARE FAMILIAR WITH
14	REGULATORY, GMP MANUFACTURING, PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT,
15	AND OTHER AREAS AS NEEDED. AND THEY PROVIDE THE
16	SCIENTIFIC SCORE ON ALL THE APPLICATIONS.
17	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ALSO INCLUDES OUR
18	PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS WHO ARE ALSO
19	MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD. THEY PROVIDE THE DEI
20	EVALUATION, THE PATIENT PERSPECTIVE ON THE
21	SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT OF THESE PROJECTS, AND
22	PROVIDE OVERSIGHT ON THE PROCESS ITSELF. THE GRANTS
23	WORKING GROUP PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS PROVIDE A DEI
24	SCORE ON ALL APPLICATIONS AND ALSO PROVIDE A
25	SUGGESTED SCIENTIFIC SCORE. WE ALSO BRING ON BOARD

28

-	
1	SCIENTIFIC SPECIALISTS AS NEEDED TO FILL IN ANY
2	KNOWLEDGE GAPS OR AREAS OF EXPERTISE THAT ARE
3	REQUIRED FROM THE PANEL. THESE MEMBERS PROVIDE A
4	SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION, BUT DO NOT PROVIDE A FINAL
5	SCORE.
6	OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO GET INTO EACH OF THE
7	APPLICATIONS. AND AS I INTRODUCE EACH OF THESE
8	APPLICATIONS, WHICH WE WILL CONSIDER INDIVIDUALLY,
9	I'M JUST GOING TO SHOW YOU A SLIDE LIKE THIS THAT
10	SHOWS THE BOARD MEMBERS THAT MAY HAVE A CONFLICT OF
11	INTEREST WITH THE APPLICATION. SO IN THIS CASE, THE
12	MEMBERS THAT ARE LISTED ON THIS TABLE HAVE DECLARED
13	A CONFLICT WITH THIS APPLICATION. AND SO,
14	THEREFORE, PLEASE BE MINDFUL OF THAT AS WE GET INTO
15	THE DISCUSSION AND VOTING.
16	SO THIS APPLICATION IS TITLED "DEVELOPMENT
17	OF AN ENGINEERED AUTOLOGOUS LEUKEMIA VACCINE FOR
18	STIMULATING CYTOLYTIC IMMUNE RESPONSES TO RESIDUAL
19	LEUKEMIC STEM CELLS." THIS IS A GENETICALLY
20	MODIFIED CANCER CELL VACCINE, AND IT IS TARGETING
21	ACUTE MYELOID LEUKEMIA OR AML. AND THE GOAL OF THIS
22	PROJECT IS TO COMPLETE PRE-IND ENABLING STUDIES AND
23	TO FILE AN IND. THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS REQUESTED IS 6
24	MILLION. THERE IS NO CO-FUNDING AND NOT REQUIRED
25	FOR THIS APPLICANT.

29

1A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGRO220,000 NEW CASES OF AML ARE DIAGNO	IOSED EACH YEAR IN
	L RATE OF ABOUT 29
3 THE U.S. WITH A FIVE-YEAR SURVIVA	
4 PERCENT. SO THERE'S CLEARLY A SI	GNIFICANT UNMET
5 NEED HERE, AND MANY PATIENTS WILL	RELAPSE AFTER
6 TREATMENT. AND HEMATOPOIETIC STE	M CELL TRANSPLANT,
7 WHICH IS ONE OF THE APPROACHES FO	OR TREATING AML, CAN
8 BE CURATIVE, BUT MANY OLDER PATIE	ENTS DON'T QUALIFY
9 FOR THIS. AND SO A NEED PARTICUL	ARLY FOR OLDER
10 PATIENTS OF A THERAPY THAT IS LES	S TOXIC IS AN UNMET
11 NEED.	
12 THE PROPOSED THERAPY UT	ILIZES A VACCINE
13 APPROACH TO STIMULATE AN IMMUNE A	TTACK AGAINST THE
14 CANCER VIA GENETIC MODIFICATION A	ND EXPRESSION OF
15 THE IMMUNE MARKERS ON CANCER CELL	S. AND THAT
16 APPROACH HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR LO	DNG-TERM
17 EFFECTIVENESS AS IT TARGETS BOTH	AML BLASTS AND
18 LEUKEMIC STEM CELLS THAT ARE OFTE	N THE SOURCE OF
19 RELAPSE. AND THIS PARTICULAR PRO	JECT QUALIFIES FOR
20 CIRM FUNDING BASED ON THE FACT TH	IAT IT TARGETS
21 CANCER STEM CELLS AND ALSO THAT I	T INVOLVES A GENE
22 THERAPY APPROACH.	
23 SIMILAR PROJECTS THAT E	EXIST IN OUR ACTIVE
24 CURRENT PORTFOLIO INCLUDE TWO OTH	IER PHASE 1 STAGE
25 CLINICAL TRIAL PROJECTS THAT ARE	ADDRESSING AML OR
30	

1	MORE BROADLY OTHER LEUKEMIAS. THESE APPROACHES ARE
2	QUITE DIFFERENT. THEY'RE NOT VACCINE APPROACHES.
3	ONE IS A MONOCLONAL ANTIBODY, AND THE OTHER IS A
4	T-CELL IMMUNOTHERAPY. SO THIS WOULD ADD ANOTHER
5	VERY DIFFERENT APPROACH TO AML.
6	THIS APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED CIRM FUNDING
7	IN THE PAST FOR EARLIER STAGE PROJECTS AT THE
8	TRANSLATIONAL STAGE FOR THE AML, AND THE PROJECT
9	OUTCOME FOR WHAT WE FUNDED WAS TO CONDUCT A PRE-IND
10	MEETING, WHICH WAS DONE AND WAS SUCCESSFUL. AND SO
11	THAT IS THE PRELUDE PROJECT TO THE CURRENT
12	APPLICATION, CLIN1 APPLICATION.
13	THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS
14	FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THE GRANTS WORKING
15	GROUP UNANIMOUSLY SCORED THIS A 1, WITH 15 MEMBERS
16	GIVING IT THAT SCORE. IT RECEIVED A DEI SCORE OF 9
17	ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 10. AND THE CIRM TEAM
18	RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS PROJECT FOR 6
19	MILLION. MR. CHAIRMAN.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO WE
21	HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
22	DR. STAMOS: SO MOVED.
23	DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED, SECONDED BY MARV.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: I'M SORRY. WHO WAS THE
	31

1	FIRST? I MISSED THAT.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MICHAEL STAMOS.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: HE CANNOT MAKE A MOTION.
4	HE IS NOT ON THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.
5	DR. STAMOS: SORRY.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YOU'RE RIGHT. THANK
7	YOU.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: OH, IT'S OKAY.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARV, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
10	MOVE UP TO THE POLL POSITION HERE?
11	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. IS THERE A
13	SECOND?
14	DR. DULIEGE: I CAN SECOND.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SECONDED BY
16	ANNE-MARIE. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
17	THE BOARD? ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?
18	HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. DAN BERNAL.
20	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
22	CLARK-HARVEY.
23	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
25	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
	32

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
2	MS. DURON: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
4	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
6	DR. FISHER: AYE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
8	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
10	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. LAUREN
12	MILLER-ROGEN.
13	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
15	DR. PADILLA: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
17	MR. PANETTA: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
19	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
21	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
25	MR. TORRES: AYE.
	33
	JJ

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
2	CARRIES.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. NEXT, GIL.
4	DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. THANK YOU, MR.
5	CHAIRMAN, THE NEXT APPLICATION, PLEASE NOTE THE
6	FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS WHO MAY HAVE A CONFLICT OF
7	INTEREST WITH THIS APPLICATION. THIS IS
8	CLIN1-14006, AND THE TITLE IS "HEMATOPOIETIC STEM
9	CELL GENE THERAPY FOR TREATMENT OF TAY-SACHS
10	DISEASE." THE GOAL OF THIS PROJECT IS TO COMPLETE
11	PRE-IND ENABLING STUDIES AND FILE AN IND THAT WILL
12	ALLOW THEM TO BEGIN A CLINICAL TRIAL. THE FUNDS
13	REQUESTED ARE A TAD OVER 5 MILLION. NO CO-FUNDING
14	IS REQUIRED FOR THIS APPLICATION.
15	BACKGROUND ON THIS DISEASE INDICATION.
16	TAY-SACHS DISEASE, IS A RARE GENETIC DISORDER THAT
17	CAUSES AN ACCUMULATION OF GANGLIOSIDES THAT BUILD UP
18	TO TOXIC LEVELS IN CELLS, PARTICULARLY NEURONS. AND
19	SO THAT RESULTS IN NEURODEGENERATION. THERE ARE A
20	NUMBER OF MANIFESTATIONS OF THE DISEASE, AND IT
21	INCLUDES AN INFANTILE, A JUVENILE, AN ADULT FORMS,
22	WITH THE INFANTILE AND JUVENILE BEING THE MOST
23	SEVERE AND OFTEN LEADING TO DEATH AT A VERY EARLY
24	AGE.
25	OVER A HUNDRED MUTATIONS IN THE
	34

1	DISEASE-CAUSING HEX A GENE HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED THAT
2	RESULT IN THE ENZYME DYSFUNCTION. FOR THIS THERAPY
3	THE VALUE PROPOSITION, THERE ARE CURRENTLY NO
4	EFFECTIVE THERAPIES OR CURES FOR TAY-SACHS. THE
5	PROPOSED CANDIDATE HAS THE POTENTIAL TO PRODUCE AND
6	DELIVER THE HEX ENZYME VIA AN AUTOLOGOUS BLOOD STEM
7	CELL TRANSPLANT TO RESTORE FUNCTION IN CELLS. SO
8	THE DELIVERY OF THE BLOOD STEM CELLS WILL ALLOW THEM
9	TO PRODUCE, SECRETE THE ENZYME AND DELIVER IT TO
10	NEURONS AND OTHER CELLS THAT REQUIRE IT.
11	THE REASON THAT THIS QUALIFIES AS A CIRM
12	PROJECT, THE CANDIDATE IS COMPOSED OF BLOOD OR
13	HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS, MAKING IT A STEM CELL
14	PROJECT.
15	WE DON'T HAVE IN OUR ACTIVE PORTFOLIO ANY
16	PROJECTS THAT ARE FOCUSED ON TAY-SACHS DISEASE. THE
17	APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING FOR A
18	TRANSLATIONAL STAGE AWARD FOR TAY-SACHS DISEASE AND
19	FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROJECT. THE OUTCOME THAT
20	WE FUNDED THEM FOR WAS FOR A PRE-IND MEETING, WHICH
21	THEY SUCCEEDED IN DOING.
22	THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE GRANTS WORKING
23	GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS APPLICATION. THIS
24	RECEIVED A UNANIMOUS SCORE OF 1 FROM 14 MEMBERS OF
25	THE WORKING GROUP. IT RECEIVED A DEI SCORE OF 7.5.

35

1	AND THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS
2	APPLICATION FOR THE AWARD AMOUNT SHOWN OF JUST OVER
3	4 MILLION.
4	MR. CHAIRMAN.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO WE
6	HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE? LET'S NOT BE SHY.
7	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SO MOVED.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A SECOND?
9	MR. PANETTA: SECOND.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THAT JOE?
11	MR. PANETTA: YES.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. THANK YOU, JOE.
13	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
14	DR. ABOUSALEM: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAD A
15	COMMENT. WOULD IT BE HELPFUL IN THE FUTURE IN
16	PRESENTING THESE PROJECTS ON THE SLIDE, WHERE WE
17	MENTION PREVIOUS FUNDING THAT THE APPLICANT
18	RECEIVED, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF WE MENTION THE
19	AMOUNT FOR EACH OF THOSE AWARDS THEY RECEIVED IN THE
20	PAST, THE DOLLAR AMOUNT.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. DULY NOTED.
22	OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
23	BOARD? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: NO.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HEARING NONE, MARIA,
	36

1	WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
3	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
5	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
7	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
9	MS. DURON: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
11	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
13	DR. FISHER: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
15	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
17	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
19	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. CHRISTINE
21	MIASKOWSKI. LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
22	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
24	DR. PADILLA: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
	27
	37

	,
1	MR. PANETTA: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
3	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
5	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
9	MR. TORRES: AYE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. NEXT, GIL.
12	DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. FOR THIS NEXT
13	APPLICATION, I'M NOT SHOWING YOU A COI SLIDE BECAUSE
14	THERE WERE NO DECLARED CONFLICTS FOR THIS.
15	THIS APPLICATION IS CLIN1-14140. AND THE
16	TITLE OF THE APPLICATION IS "IND-ENABLING ACTIVITIES
17	FOR A MASKED IMMUNOCYTOKINE." THE THERAPY IS AN
18	ANTIBODY AND INTERFERON ALPHA FUSION PROTEIN, AND IT
19	IS TARGETED TO ADVANCE THE METASTATIC SOLID TUMORS
20	AND MULTIPLE MYELOMA. THE GOAL OF THIS PROJECT IS
21	TO COMPLETE PRE-IND ENABLING STUDIES AND FILE AN
22	IND. THE AMOUNT REQUESTED IS JUST UNDER 4 MILLION.
23	CO-FUNDING IS REQUIRED FOR THIS APPLICANT OF 20
24	PERCENT. IT'S PROVIDING JUST UNDER 1 MILLION.
25	THE BACKGROUND ON THIS PARTICULAR SET OF
	38

1	INDICATIONS, SO THERE ARE CANCERS THAT HAVE A
2	PREVALENCE OF CD 138 EXPRESSION, INCLUDING MULTIPLE
3	MYELOMA AND SEVERAL TYPES OF SOLID TUMORS. AND
4	THERE ARE A VARIETY OF TREATMENTS THAT ARE APPROVED
5	FOR THESE, BUT OFTEN PATIENTS WILL EXPERIENCE
6	ADVANCED OR METASTATIC DISEASE WILL RELAPSE OR ARE
7	REFRACTORY TO MANY OF THOSE TREATMENTS. INTERFERON
8	ALPHA THERAPIES ARE AVAILABLE TO TREAT MULTIPLE
9	MYELOMA FOLLOWING FIRST IN LINE THERAPY, BUT CAN BE
10	LIMITED BY TOXICITY, MEANING THE DOSE THAT CAN BE
11	APPLIED IS VERY LIMITED DUE TO SYSTEMWIDE TOXICITY.
12	IF SUCCESSFUL, THE PROPOSED THERAPY WOULD
13	PROVIDE A SAFER AND EFFECTIVE THERAPEUTIC OPTION FOR
14	PATIENTS DUE TO IT'S TARGETED VIA THE ANTIBODY
15	COMPONENT AND MASKED DELIVERY OF THE INTERFERON TO
16	THE TUMOR SITE WHICH REVEALS THE INTERFERON ALPHA
17	ONLY AFTER IT REACHES THE TUMOR AND, THEREFORE,
18	ALLOWING GREATER DOSING OF THIS PRODUCT.
19	THIS IS A THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE THAT
20	TARGETS CANCER STEM CELLS AND, THEREFORE, WHY IT
21	QUALIFIES FOR CIRM FUNDING.
22	THIS IS THE LIST OF PROJECTS IN OUR
23	PORTFOLIO THAT IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER ADDRESS SOLID
24	TUMORS BROADLY OR MORE SPECIFICALLY MULTIPLE
25	MYELOMA. WE DO HAVE OTHER PROJECTS THAT TARGET
	39

1	DIFFERENT TYPES OF CANCERS AND TUMORS. THESE THREE,
2	I THOUGHT, WERE THE MOST RELATED TO THIS PROJECT
3	BECAUSE OF ITS BROAD ACCESS TO SOLID TUMORS OR
4	BECAUSE OF MULTIPLE MYELOMA.
5	THE APPROACHES THAT ARE TAKEN ON BY THESE
6	OTHER PORTFOLIO PROJECTS VARY. ONE USES AN
7	ONCOLYTIC VIRUS WITH INDUCED KILLER CELLS. TWO
8	OTHERS USE A CAR T APPROACH, ONE THAT IS FOCUSED ON
9	USING NATURAL KILLER T-CELLS. SO A BIT DIFFERENT IN
10	TERMS OF THEIR APPROACH COMPARED TO THE CURRENT
11	PROJECT. THIS APPLICANT HAS NOT PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED
12	CIRM FUNDING.
13	AND THE SUMMARY OF THE GRANTS WORKING
14	GROUP RECOMMENDATION IS AS SHOWN. THERE WERE 11
15	MEMBERS WHO GAVE IT A SCORE OF 1, THREE THAT GAVE IT
16	A SCORE OF 2, AND ONE THAT GAVE IT A SCORE OF 3.
17	THE DEI SCORE FOR THIS APPLICATION IS A 6 ON A SCALE
18	OF 1 TO 10, AND THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO
19	FUND FOR THE AMOUNT SHOWN, JUST UNDER 4 MILLION.
20	MR. CHAIRMAN.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO WE
22	HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
23	DR. SOUTHARD: SO MOVED.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, MARV. IS THERE
25	A SECOND?
	40
	טד

1	MS. DURON: SECOND.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL.
3	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
4	I ACTUALLY HAVE A QUESTION, GIL. MANY OF
5	THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE FUNDED OVER THE YEARS SORT
6	OF HAVE APPLICABILITY TO EITHER BLOOD CANCERS OR
7	SOLID TUMORS. HOW MANY LIKE THIS DO WE HAVE THAT
8	ACTUALLY HAS AN ASPECT POTENTIALLY OF BOTH?
9	DR. SAMBRANO: IT'S UNUSUAL. MANY OF THE
10	PROJECTS, AS YOU NOTED, EITHER FOCUS ON SOLID TUMORS
11	GENERALLY OR ON ONE SPECIFIC SOLID TUMOR ON BLOOD
12	LEUKEMIAS SUCH AS ACUTE MYELOID LEUKEMIA OR OTHER
13	THINGS. BUT, YES, IT'S UNUSUAL TO HAVE SOMETHING
14	THAT HAS A BROAD SCOPE LIKE THIS.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. JUST WANTED
16	TO BRING THAT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE BOARD. OTHER
17	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS?
18	DR. FISHER: I'VE GOT MY HAND UP, J.T.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, FRED.
20	DR. FISHER: I'M WONDERING IF YOU CAN
21	PROVIDE US ANY FURTHER INSIGHT GIVEN THAT IT SEEMS
22	LIKE ABOUT A THIRD OR MAYBE A LITTLE MORE THAN A
23	THIRD OF THE GWG THOUGHT THAT IT SHOULD COME BACK OR
24	NOT BE FUNDED AT ALL. AND IF YOU HAVE ANY MORE TO
25	SAY ABOUT THAT.

41

-	
1	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. IN LOOKING AT THE
2	RATIONALE BEHIND THE SCORES OF 2 OR 3, I THINK MOST
3	OF THIS, AND I CAN'T TELL YOU EXACTLY WHY A REVIEWER
4	GAVE THE PARTICULAR SCORE THEY DID, BUT BASED ON
5	COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION, IT SEEMS TO FOCUS ON THEIR
6	BELIEF THAT THIS IS ACTING SPECIFICALLY ON CANCER
7	STEM CELLS OR NOT. SO FOR PROJECTS LIKE THIS, THE
8	REQUIREMENTS OR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR COMING IN
9	IS THAT THEY ACT IN SOME WAY ON A CANCER STEM CELL
10	AND THAT THE MECHANISM OF ACTION IS IN SOME WAY
11	RELATED TO THAT ACTION ON THE CANCER STEM CELL. AND
12	THAT'S THE BASIC REQUIREMENT.
13	AND SO THE REVIEWERS, WHEN THEY CONSIDER
14	THESE PROJECTS, WILL OFTEN HAVE VARIED OPINIONS AS
15	TO HOW WHERE THEY SET THE BAR AS TO HOW SPECIFIC
16	THE PRODUCT NEEDS TO BE. SOME REVIEWERS WILL FEEL
17	IT NEEDS TO BE EXCLUSIVELY ACTING ON CANCER STEM
18	CELLS TO GIVE THEM MORE CONFIDENCE THAT THE MOA IS
19	REALLY THROUGH THE CANCER STEM CELLS. OTHERS VIEW
20	IT WITH MORE FLEXIBILITY IN TERMS OF ACTING ON
21	CANCER STEM CELLS BUT ALSO ON OTHER CELLS OF THE
22	CANCER OR TUMOR. AND A LOT OF THE DISCUSSION
23	RELATED TO THOSE DIFFERENCES, I THINK, AS REFLECTED
24	IN THOSE SCORES.
25	DR. FISHER: THANKS.
	42

1	
1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. OTHER
2	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
3	ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: NO HANDS RAISED, J.T.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. WILL
6	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
8	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
10	CLARK-HARVEY.
11	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
13	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
15	MS. DURON: AYE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
17	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
19	DR. FISHER: AYE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
21	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
23	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
25	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
	43

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. CHRISTINE
2	MIASKOWSKI. LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
3	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
5	DR. PADILLA: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
7	MR. PANETTA: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
9	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
11	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
15	MR. TORRES: AYE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
17	MOTION CARRIES.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. LAST
19	CLIN FOR THIS MEETING, GIL.
20	DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. FOR THIS NEXT
21	APPLICATION, HERE IS THE LIST OF CONFLICTS FOR THE
22	APPLICATION.
23	AND THIS IS CLIN2-14302. IT'S ENTITLED
24	"PHASE 3 TRIAL AND RELATED ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT
25	CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED HUMAN
	44

1	UMBILICAL CORD-DERIVED VASCULAR (ENDOTHELIAL)
2	CELLS." THIS IS A CELL THERAPY, MEDICALLY MODIFIED
3	ENDOTHELIAL CELLS. THE INDICATION IS FOR SEVERE
4	REGIMEN RELATED TOXICITIES FROM TREATMENT FOR
5	LYMPHOMA.
6	THE GOAL IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 3 TRIAL.
7	THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE 15 MILLION. CO-FUNDING OF
8	40 PERCENT IS REQUIRED AND PROVIDED IN THE JUST OVER
9	\$10 MILLION AMOUNT FROM THE APPLICANT.
10	SO BACKGROUND ON THIS. CANCER THERAPIES
11	OFTEN EMPLOY REGIMENS THAT DAMAGE OTHERWISE HEALTHY
12	TISSUES AND ORGANS. AND SEVERE REGIMEN RELATED
13	TOXICITIES OR SRRT'S IS SOMETHING THAT CAN BECOME
14	LIFE-THREATENING AND LIMITS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
15	THERAPIES, INCLUDING HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL
16	TRANSPLANTS, AS THE DOSING HAS TO BE LIMITED IN
17	ORDER TO AVOID SEVERE TOXICITIES. AND OFTEN THAT
18	RESULTS IN LESS EFFECTIVE TREATMENT AGAINST THE
19	CANCER.
20	THE STANDARD OF CARE FOR THE SRRT INCLUDES
21	PROPHYLAXIS SUPPORTED TREATMENTS TO ADDRESS
22	SYMPTOMS. HOWEVER, THE PROPOSED THERAPY HERE AIMS
23	TO TARGET THE UNDERLYING CAUSE OF THE SRRT BY ACTING
24	ON AND RESTORING THE ENDOGENOUS STEM CELL VASCULAR
25	NEED IN ORGANS. AND IF SUCCESSFUL, THIS APPROACH
	45

1	COULD SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE OUTCOMES FOR PATIENTS
2	UNDERGOING A VARIETY OF THERAPIES FOR CANCER. THE
3	TARGET FOR THIS PARTICULAR TRIAL IS ON LYMPHOMA
4	PATIENTS, BUT COULD HAVE MUCH BROADER IMPLICATIONS
5	IF IT'S SUCCESSFUL.
6	THE CANDIDATE TARGETS ENDOGENOUS STEM
7	CELLS FOR A THERAPEUTIC EFFECT, AND THAT IS WHY IT
8	IS QUALIFIED FOR CIRM FUNDING.
9	THE SIMILAR PROJECTS IN OUR PORTFOLIO INCLUDES ONE
10	THAT IS MARGINALLY RELATED. THIS IS A PHASE 1
11	CLINICAL TRIAL THAT IS FOCUSED ON TREATING GRAFT
12	VERSUS HOST DISEASE THAT'S RELATED TO TREATMENT IN
13	T-CELL CANCERS AND LEUKEMIAS. SO THIS IS SIMILARLY
14	A TOXICITY, IF YOU WILL, FOLLOWING TREATMENT WITH
15	THIS CANDIDATE, WHICH IS A T-CELL IMMUNOTHERAPY
16	WHICH IT ATTEMPTS TO ADDRESS. AND SO IT IS SOMEWHAT
17	SIMILAR, BUT NOT FOCUSED NECESSARILY ON THE SRRT AS
18	BROADLY AS IN THIS PARTICULAR PROPOSAL.
19	THIS APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED CIRM FUNDING
20	IN THE PAST AND HAS TWO PROJECTS THAT ARE RELATED.
21	THERE WAS A CLIN1 AND A CLIN2 SHOWN HERE, THE
22	IND-ENABLING WORK AND PHASE 1 TRIAL FOR AN IMMUNE
23	BLOOD CELL RECONSTITUTION FOLLOWING MYELOABLATION.
24	SO THE GOAL BEHIND THIS WAS THAT THEIR PRODUCT WOULD
25	HELP RECONSTITUTE THE IMMUNE SYSTEM AND THE BLOOD
	16

46

-	
1	CELLS. THIS IS A CELL THERAPY AND IS STILL GOING, I
2	THINK, MAY STILL BE ACTIVE IN THE PHASE 1 TRIAL.
3	AND THEN WE ALSO FUNDED AN INITIAL TRIAL,
4	PHASE 1 TRIAL, OF THIS CURRENT INDICATION FOR THE
5	SEVERE REGIMEN RELATED TOXICITY THAT WE SUPPORTED,
6	AND THAT PROJECT ENDED IN APRIL. AND THEY WERE
7	SUCCESSFUL IN MEETING ALL THEIR MILESTONES. AND
8	JUST OF NOTE, THE AWARD AMOUNTS ARE SHOWN HERE THAT
9	WE HAVE PROVIDED FOR THE CURRENT APPLICANT.
10	THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE GRANTS WORKING
11	GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS. WE HAD TEN MEMBERS WHO GAVE
12	THIS A SCORE OF 1, THREE MEMBERS THAT GAVE IT A
13	SCORE OF 2. THE DEI SCORE WAS AN 8 ON A SCALE OF 1
14	TO 10, AND THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND
15	THIS PROJECT FOR 15 MILLION. MR. CHAIRMAN.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. MOTION
17	TO APPROVE?
18	DR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, DAVID. SECOND?
20	WHO WAS THAT SECOND? SORRY.
21	MR. BERNAL: SECOND.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: IT WAS DAN.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, DAN. QUESTIONS,
24	COMMENTS, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
25	DR. DULIEGE: BRIEFLY, ACTUALLY MOSTLY A
	47

1	COMMENT. PHASE 3 TRIAL, REMARKABLE MILESTONES, VERY
2	RISKY AND CHALLENGING. CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CIRM
3	FOR MOVING OR HELPING TO MOVE MANY COMPOUNDS TO THIS
4	STAGE. CAN YOU REMIND US, IT PROBABLY HAS NOTHING
5	TO DO WITH THE VOTE, HOW MANY PHASE 3 TRIALS HAVE WE
6	FUNDED SO FAR?
7	DR. SAMBRANO: I DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO
8	THAT.
9	DR. DULIEGE: ROUGHLY.
10	DR. SAMBRANO: ABLA CREASEY, IF YOU'RE ON,
11	OR MARIA MILLAN MAY HAVE A BETTER SENSE.
12	DR. DULIEGE: OR MAYBE SEPARATE. I
13	REALIZE IT HAS NOTHING TO DO, BUT I JUST WANTED TO
14	POINT OUT THAT WE RARELY GET TO VOTE ON PHASE 3
15	TRIALS, AND THIS IS ALWAYS AN EXCITING STEP.
16	DR. SAMBRANO: YES, IT IS UNUSUAL. WE
17	HAVE HAD VERY FEW THAT HAVE COME THROUGH, BUT WE
18	HAVE HAD AT LEAST TWO OR THREE OVER THE COURSE OF
19	SEVERAL YEARS THAT WE'VE FUNDED.
20	DR. DULIEGE: RIGHT. MAJOR MILESTONE.
21	THAT'S IT.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.
23	OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
24	BOARD? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY.
	48

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. MARIA, WILL
1 2	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
4	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
6	CLARK-HARVEY.
7	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
9	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
11	MS. DURON: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
13	FRED FISHER.
14	DR. FISHER: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
16	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
18	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
20	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. CHRISTINE
22	MIASKOWSKI. LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
23	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
25	DR. PADILLA: YES.
	49

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
2	MR. PANETTA: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
4	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
6	JONATHAN THOMAS.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
9	MR. TORRES: AYE.
10	DR. SOUTHARD: THIS IS MARV. I VOTE YES.
11	I WAS JUST MUTED.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: OH, THANK YOU, MARV. THE
13	MOTION DEFINITELY CARRIES. THANK YOU.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU,
15	GIL, AND YOUR REVIEW TEAM. THAT CONCLUDES THE
16	APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE PORTION OF TODAY'S
17	MEETING. WE'LL MOVE ON NEXT TO ITEM 10,
18	CONSIDERATION OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE STANDARDS
19	WORKING GROUP. GEOFF LOMAX. GEOFF.
20	DR. LOMAX: THANKS. I THINK WE HAVE SOME
21	SLIDES THAT ARE GOING TO COME UP.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. MARIANNE IS GETTING
23	THOSE READY.
24	DR. LOMAX: CHAIRMAN THOMAS, MEMBERS OF
25	THE BOARD, MY NAME IS GEOFF LOMAX, SENIOR SCIENCE
	50

1	OFFICER WITH THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS AND POLICY TEAM.
2	AS YOU MAY RECALL, AT OUR SEPTEMBER 29TH
3	MEETING, I PROVIDED YOU WITH AN UPDATE ON THE CHARGE
4	OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP: CONTEMPORARY ISSUES
5	IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, ETHICS, AND POLICY. AND I
6	DESCRIBED THE PROCESS FOR RECRUITING MEMBERS TO THE
7	WORKING GROUP WHICH IS ILLUSTRATED IN THIS SLIDE.
8	AT THE SEPTEMBER MEETING, YOU ALSO CONFIRMED JEFFREY
9	KHAN AND FRED FISHER AS CO-CHAIRS TO THE WORKING
10	GROUP IN PART TO SUPPORT THE RECRUITMENT PROCESS.
11	I'D ALSO LIKE TO ACKNOWLEDGE CHAIRMAN
12	THOMAS'S LEADERSHIP IN CANDIDATE RECRUITMENT. TODAY
13	I BRING FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION A ROSTER OF
14	CANDIDATES. PURSUANT TO PROPOSITION 14, THE
15	CANDIDATE POOL INCLUDES MEDICAL ETHICISTS,
16	SCIENTISTS AND CLINICIANS, AND ICOC PATIENT ADVOCATE
17	AND NURSE MEMBERS.
18	YOUR BACKGROUND MATERIALS PROVIDE A BRIEF
19	BIOSKETCH FOR EACH OF THE MEDICAL ETHICISTS AND
20	SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS AND ALSO INCLUDES A LINK IF YOU
21	ARE INTERESTED IN A MORE COMPREHENSIVE BIOSKETCH FOR
22	EACH OF THE CANDIDATES. I WILL NOW BRIEFLY REVIEW
23	THE MEDICAL ETHICISTS AND CLINICIAN CANDIDATES FOR
24	CONSIDERATION.
25	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. FIRST, THE MEDICAL
	51
	JT

1	ETHICIST CANDIDATES. MISS TERRY BRINGS EXPERTISE IN
2	GENETIC PRIVACY AND DATA SHARING WITH A STRONG
3	EMPHASIS ON PATIENT ENGAGEMENT AND EMPOWERMENT IN
4	RESEARCH.
5	MISS LOPES BRINGS REGULATORY POLICY
6	EXPERTISE WITH AN EMPHASIS IN THE DESIGN AND
7	IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDELINES AND POLICIES IN STEM
8	CELL RESEARCH OVERSIGHT AT A MAJOR ACADEMIC
9	INSTITUTION.
10	AND DR. ROMMELFANGER BRINGS LEADERSHIP IN
11	NEUROETHICS AND WAS DEEMED IMPORTANT GIVEN CIRM'S
12	COMMITMENT TO DISEASES OF THE BRAIN AND
13	NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASES.
14	AND JUST AS A REMINDER, JEFF KAHN ROUNDS
15	OUT THE FOUR POSITIONS, THE ETHICIST POSITIONS.
16	AND, AGAIN, HE WAS ACKNOWLEDGED IN THE SEPTEMBER
17	MEETING. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
18	THE SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICIAN CANDIDATES,
19	DR. ROUCE BRINGS UNIQUE EXPERIENCE IN BOTH CLINICAL
20	RESEARCH AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN ADDITION TO
21	BEING AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
22	AND THE CROSSOVER BETWEEN GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND
23	THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP IS VERY IMPORTANT AS IT
24	GIVES THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE RIGOR THAT GOES INTO
25	THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION OF CIRM APPLICATIONS. SO

1	WE SEE A LOT OF VALUE THERE.
2	DR. LEE BRINGS A BROAD UNDERSTANDING OF
3	THE BASIC AND TRANSLATIONAL SPACE WITH PARTICULAR
4	INSIGHTS INTO ANIMAL RESEARCH ETHICS.
5	DR. SAHA COMBINES STEM CELL ENGINEERING,
6	GENE EDITING, AND REPROGRAMMING WITH A VERY UNIQUE
7	BACKGROUND IN BOTH MEDICAL HISTORY AND ETHICS, AND
8	HAS SERVED ON NUMEROUS ETHICS POLICIES ADVISORY
9	COMMITTEES IN ADDITION TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
10	AT CIRM.
11	DR. SHARMA BRINGS CLINICAL EXPERIENCE IN
12	GENE THERAPY FOR SICKLE CELL DISEASE COMBINED WITH
13	EXTENSIVE SCHOLARSHIP INTO PATIENT EDUCATION AND
14	CONSENT. HE WILL BE PROVIDING A REVIEW OF HIS WORK
15	AT THE JANUARY STANDARDS WORKING GROUP MEETING IF
16	CONFIRMED.
17	DR. WAGNER, WHO HAS WORKED ON RARE GENETIC
18	DISORDERS AND HAS FREQUENTLY ADDRESSED RISK/BENEFIT
19	CONSIDERATIONS IN EXPERIMENTAL GENE THERAPIES AND IS
20	ALSO ACTIVE ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
21	AND FINALLY, DR. ROSSANT IS ONE OF THE
22	WORLD'S LEADING SCHOLARS IN DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY
23	AND EMBRYO RESEARCH. AND SHE RECEIVED THE 2021
24	ISSCR, THAT'S THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR STEM
25	CELL RESEARCH, ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FOR HER WORK IN
	50
	53

1	DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
2	AND FINALLY, A REMINDER OF THE PATIENT
3	ADVOCATE AND NURSE CANDIDATES WHO HAVE AGREED TO
4	SERVE ON THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AND WE THANK
5	YOU SINCERELY FOR YOUR SERVICE. SO THIS ROUNDS OUT
6	THE ROSTER OF CANDIDATES, AND THE CIRM TEAM
7	RECOMMENDS APPROVAL. THANK YOU.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MR. LOMAX.
9	DR. LOMAX. I JUST WANTED TO POINT OUT THAT THE TASK
10	OF PUTTING TOGETHER THIS GROUP WAS A CONSIDERABLE
11	ONE, WHICH INVOLVED A LOT OF WORK UNDER DR. LOMAX'S
12	LEADERSHIP IN SOURCING THE RIGHT COMBINATION OF
13	FOLKS TO BRING TO BEAR IN THIS WORKING GROUP SO THAT
14	WE HAVE A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS BROUGHT TO THE
15	TABLE THAT WILL BEAR ON THE VARIOUS ISSUES THAT THE
16	WORKING GROUP COVERS. SO THANK YOU, GEOFF, FOR YOUR
17	HARD WORK ON THAT.
18	DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE THIS
19	ROSTER?
20	DR. BARRETT: SO MOVED.
21	MR. TORRES: SECOND.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: I'M SORRY. WHO WAS THE
24	FIRST?
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: KIM.
	54

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: GREAT. THANK YOU.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY ART.
3	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? I
4	ALSO WANT TO POINT OUT, BY THE WAY, FRED, THANK YOU
5	FOR BEING VICE CHAIR. THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT
6	TASK, AND YOU BROUGHT A LOT OF LEADERSHIP ALREADY TO
7	THIS POINT AND, OF COURSE, WILL CONTINUE AS THINGS
8	PLAY OUT DOWN THE ROAD. SO THANK YOU.
9	DR. FISHER: THANK YOU.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
11	THE PUBLIC? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE
12	CALL THE ROLL.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. JUST AS A
14	REMINDER. LEONDRA AND ELENA, SINCE YOU ARE ON THE
15	ROSTER, I WILL NOT CALL YOUR NAME.
16	HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
17	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMAD ABOUSALEM.
19	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
21	DR. BARRETT: AYE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
23	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
25	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
	55

_	,,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN. LINDA
2	BOXER.
3	DR. BOXER: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU. DEBORAH DEAS.
5	DR. DEAS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
7	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
9	MS. DURON: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
11	FRED FISHER.
12	DR. FISHER: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
14	DR. GASSON: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
16	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
18	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
20	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. PAT LEVITT.
22	DR. LEVITT: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS. SHLOMO
24	MELMED.
25	DR. MELMED: YES.
	50
	56

_	·
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
2	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
4	DR. PADILLA: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
6	MR. PANETTA: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
8	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
10	DR. SELICK: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
12	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
14	DR. STAMOS: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18	MR. TORRES: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO
21	ITEM 11, CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE SHARED
22	RESOURCE LABS CONCEPT PLAN. PRESENTATION FROM
23	GRIESHAMMER. UTA.
24	DR. GRIESHAMMER: YES. THANK YOU,
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS. GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. I'LL
	57

1	SHARE MY SCREEN. GIVE ME A MOMENT.
2	GOOD MORNING. ON BEHALF OF THE SCIENTIFIC
3	PROGRAMS TEAM, I WILL BE PRESENTING A SMALL
4	AMENDMENT TO THE CONCEPT PLAN FOR SHARED RESOURCE
5	LABORATORIES FOR STEM CELL-BASED MODELING OR AS I'LL
6	BE CALLING IT SRL FOR SHORT.
7	THE SRL CONCEPT IS ALIGNED WITH CIRM'S
8	MISSION TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER
9	TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN
10	AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND
11	WORLD.
12	OKAY. YOU ALL APPROVED THE SHARED
13	RESOURCES LAB CONCEPT IN OCTOBER, AND TODAY WE ARE
14	BRINGING A PROPOSED CHANGE TO YOU FOR YOUR
15	CONSIDERATION, A CHANGE IN THE PERCENT EFFORT,
16	COMMITMENT WE'LL REQUIRE OF THE APPLICANT PROGRAM
17	DIRECTOR.
18	BEFORE I PRESENT THE SPECIFIC PROPOSED
19	AMENDMENT, I'D LIKE TO PROVIDE SOME BACKGROUND
20	INFORMATION AND RATIONALE FOR OUR REQUEST. WE
21	EXPECT THAT LEADERSHIP FOR A SHARED RESOURCE LABS
22	AWARD WOULD PROVIDE THREE MAIN FUNCTIONS. FIRST,
23	THEY WOULD BE EXPECTED TO ENSURE THE SCIENTIFIC
24	EXCELLENCE OF THE STEM CELL-BASED MODELS THAT ARE
25	OFFERED IN THEIR SHARED RESOURCE LABS CORE. SECOND,

1 THEY WOULD BE EXPECTED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE STEERIN	IG
2 COMMITTEE THAT WILL CONSIST OF THE AWARDEES AND ALS	50
3 EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS. AS A QUICK REMINDER, THE	
4 STEERING COMMITTEE WILL BE CHARGED WITH DEVELOPING	
5 PROCESSES TO COORDINATE A NETWORK OF SHARED RESOURCE	E
6 LABS, DEVELOPING CERTAIN STANDARDS ACROSS THE	
7 NETWORK, AND DEVELOPING COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES	
8 TOWARD IMPROVING REPRODUCIBILITY OF STEM CELL-BASE)
9 MODELS. AND THIRD, THE SRL LEADERSHIP WOULD OVERSI	E
10 THE OPERATIONS OF THEIR CORE FACILITY.	
11 SO WE REALIZE THAT THE GOALS OF A SHARED	
12 RESOURCE LAB MAY BEST BE ACHIEVED BY A LEADERSHIP	
13 TEAM CONSISTING OF TWO INDIVIDUALS RATHER THAN A	
14 SINGLE PROGRAM DIRECTOR. ONE REASON BEING THAT	
15 THESE THREE FUNCTIONS REQUIRE DIVERSE TYPES OF	
16 EXPERTISE. AND ANOTHER CONSIDERATION IS THAT WE	
17 WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN ATTRACT SCIENTIFIC	
18 LEADERS IN STEM CELL-BASED MODELING TO APPLY FOR	
19 THIS OPPORTUNITY WITHOUT HAVING TO COMMIT TOO HIGH	A
20 PERCENT EFFORT.	
21 SO OUR REQUEST OF THE BOARD TODAY	
22 ENVISIONS THAT, IN ADDITION TO THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR	κ ,
23 APPLICATIONS MAY PROPOSE TO INCLUDE A SECOND KEY	
24 PERSON WITH A LEADERSHIP ROLE.	
25 THE ORIGINAL CONCEPT STIPULATED THAT	
59	

1	PROGRAM DIRECTORS MUST COMMIT AT LEAST 20 PERCENT
2	EFFORT, AND WE ARE NOW PROPOSING TO CHANGE THIS AS
3	OUTLINED HERE. THE APPLICANT PROGRAM DIRECTOR MUST
4	COMMIT AT LEAST 5 PERCENT EFFORT, AND THE OVERALL
5	LEADERSHIP FOR A SHARED RESOURCE LAB MUST COMMIT AT
6	LEAST A COMBINED EFFORT OF 20 PERCENT. THIS CAN BE
7	ACHIEVED BY A SINGLE PROGRAM DIRECTOR WITH A 20
8	PERCENT EFFORT OR BY A PROGRAM DIRECTOR WITH ONE
9	ADDITIONAL KEY PERSON IN A LEADERSHIP ROLE.
10	SO I'D NOW LIKE TO ASK THAT THE BOARD
11	APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT TO THE SHARED RESOURCE LABS
12	CONCEPT PLAN. AND I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS
13	YOU MAY HAVE.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, UTA. DO I
15	HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?
16	DR. SOUTHARD: SO MOVED.
17	CONTROLLER YEE: THANK YOU, MARV. DID A
18	LOT OF MOVING TODAY.
19	DR. SOUTHARD: YEAH.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECOND?
21	DR. ABDULHAQ: SECOND.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, HAIFAA. OKAY.
23	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMED HAS HIS HAND
25	RAISED AS DOES PAT AND ANNE-MARIE.
	60

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. MOHAMMED.
2	DR. ABOUSALEM: THANK YOU, J.T. AND A
3	QUESTION, UTA. DO YOU HAVE A DEFINITION FOR WHAT A
4	PROGRAM DIRECTOR ROLE ENTAILS AND WHAT THE SECOND
5	LEADER ROLE ENTAILS BECAUSE, IF WE'RE GOING FROM 20
6	PERCENT TO 5 PERCENT ON THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR, WHAT
7	ARE WE WHAT MIGHT WE MISS FROM THAT
8	RESPONSIBILITY IF THAT SECOND LEADERSHIP ROLE IS NOT
9	DEFINED?
10	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THANK YOU. SO I THINK
11	MY GENERAL ANSWER IS THAT THE THREE LEADERSHIP
12	FUNCTIONS THAT I PRESENTED WOULD BE EXPECTED TO BE
13	COVERED BY THE TWO INDIVIDUALS. AND WE WOULD LEAVE
14	IT TO THE APPLICANT TEAM AND THE ONE OR TWO PEOPLE
15	THEY BRING FORWARD TO MAKE A CASE THAT THESE THREE
16	LEADERSHIP ROLES ARE WELL COVERED BY EITHER THE ONE
17	PERSON OR THE TWO PEOPLE.
18	I THINK AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT I COULD
19	ENVISION IS THAT A PROGRAM DIRECTOR WOULD WITH,
20	LET'S SAY, 5 OR 10 PERCENT SO THEY CAN CHOOSE HOW
21	TO DISTRIBUTE THEIR EFFORT. SO ONE SCENARIO I
22	ENVISION IS THAT THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR WITH, LET'S
23	SAY, 5 OR 10 PERCENT EFFORT WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR
24	THE OVERALL EXCELLENCE OF THE STEM CELL-BASED MODELS
25	AND THE PARTICIPATION ON THE STEERING COMMITTEE THAT

1	WILL DRIVE THESE NETWORK FUNCTIONS, WHILE A SECOND
2	PERSON IN THE LEADERSHIP ROLE MIGHT BE MORE FOCUSED
3	ON OVERSEEING THE OPERATIONS AT A HIGH LEVEL OF THE
4	ACTUAL CORE.
5	DR. ABOUSALEM: THANK YOU.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PAT.
7	DR. LEVITT: SO 5 PERCENT EFFORT, I'VE
8	RARELY SEEN THAT EVEN ON INDIVIDUAL RO1S AT NIH OR
9	INDIVIDUAL GRANTS. AND I'M A BIT WORRIED
10	CONSIDERING THE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT THE FACILITIES
11	HAVE IN TERMS OF DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES AS WELL
12	AS MAINTAINING EXCELLENCE WITHIN THE CORE ITSELF.
13	AND SO I'M WORRIED AT 5 PERCENT FOR THE PROGRAM
14	DIRECTOR. WHOEVER THAT IS IS CLEARLY GOING TO HAVE
15	TO BE PART OF STEERING COMMITTEES, INTERACT WITH
16	OTHER CENTERS, AND THEN MAINTAIN, I THINK, A DEEP
17	UNDERSTANDING OF ENSURING THE QUALITY OF WHAT IS
18	BEING GENERATED, DISTRIBUTING PROTOCOLS, WORKING
19	WITH THE CENTERS THAT ARE GOING TO BE ESTABLISHED.
20	ALL THOSE RESPONSIBILITIES TO ME I MEAN 5 PERCENT
21	IS TWO HOURS A WEEK, RIGHT, BASED ON THE
22	CALCULATIONS THAT NIH DOES. AND I CAN UNDERSTAND 10
23	PERCENT. 10 PERCENT IS THE NORM FOR SENIOR
24	INVESTIGATORS, IN PARTICULAR, FOR EXTRAMURAL GRANTS.
25	SO I REALLY STRUGGLE WITH THIS 5 PERCENT.

62

1	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR
2	PERSPECTIVE. I WOULD CERTAINLY OFFER THAT THE BOARD
3	CAN DECIDE WHAT THE PERCENTAGE SHOULD BE, AMEND THE
4	AMENDMENT, IF YOU SO LIKE. CERTAINLY BE UP TO YOU.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO I THINK, UTA,
6	PAT'S COMMENTS I FOUND PERSUASIVE. AND, PAT, ARE
7	YOU RECOMMENDING THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO
8	INCREASE 5 TO 10 PERCENT?
9	DR. LEVITT: I WOULD DO THAT, BUT I THINK
10	WE SHOULD HEAR FROM OTHERS FIRST BEFORE WE ENTERTAIN
11	ANY CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL AMENDMENT. I MAY BE IN
12	THE MINORITY IN TERMS OF MY VIEWS, AND I DON'T WANT
13	TO INDEPENDENTLY DRIVE THE PROCESS. I JUST PUT MY
14	PERSPECTIVE OUT THERE.
15	ALSO, HAVING RUN CORES MYSELF AND NOW
16	OVERSEEING A LOT OF CORES OF THE INSTITUTION THAT
17	I'M AT, SO IT WOULD BE GOOD TO HEAR FROM OTHERS.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANNE-MARIE.
19	DR. DULIEGE: I DO SHARE THE CONCERN
20	EXPRESSED BY PAT ABOUT 5 PERCENT. BUT MY QUESTION
21	IS, UTA, CAN YOU TELL US REALLY WHY WE ARE MAKING
22	THIS CHANGE? I KNOW WE'VE ALL REVIEWED YOUR SLIDES,
23	READ YOUR SLIDES, BUT YOUR VOICE-OVER, REALLY WHAT
24	JUSTIFIES SUFFICIENT FOR A CHANGE? AND ARE WE AT
25	RISK OF SOMEWHAT MICROMANAGING WHAT'S HAPPENING AT

1	INDIVIDUAL LABS? COULD WE HAVE MORE OF A BLANKET
2	STATEMENT ABOUT A MINIMUM OF 20 OR 25 PERCENT TO BE
3	SHARED AMONG TWO OR THREE INDIVIDUALS THAT COVER
4	THIS AND THIS AND THAT EXPERTISE SO THAT WE ARE NOT
5	MICROMANAGING? THESE ARE MY TWO QUESTIONS.
6	DR. GRIESHAMMER: YEAH. SO I SORT OF
7	REITERATE, I THINK, THE CONCERN OF ASKING THAT THE
8	APPLICANT PROGRAM DIRECTOR COMMIT 20 PERCENT MAY
9	DISINCENTIVIZE OR MAKE IT ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE FOR
10	LEADERS, THE EXPERTS AND LEADERS, IN THE FIELD TO
11	BECOME OR OFFER OR APPLY AS PROGRAM DIRECTORS GIVEN
12	OTHER COMMITMENTS THAT THEY HAVE. AND WE REALLY
13	WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE THEM ON BOARD
14	ESPECIALLY AS WE ARE ENVISIONING THAT THESE SHARED
15	LABS WILL BE COORDINATED INTO A NETWORK. AND WE
16	WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ALLOW THE TOP LEADERS TO
17	BE ABLE TO APPLY.
18	IN TERMS OF MICROMANAGING HOW THE
19	LEADERSHIP TEAM COMES ABOUT, I WOULD SAY THAT WE
20	CERTAINLY WE WOULD LEAVE IT UP TO THEM TO DECIDE
21	IF THEY WANT TO COME IN AS A SINGLE PROGRAM DIRECTOR
22	OR TWO PEOPLE IN THE LEADERSHIP ROLE, AND IF THEY
23	COME WITH TWO, HOW THEY DIVIDE THOSE
24	RESPONSIBILITIES.
25	NOW, I THINK YOU WERE SAYING WHY NOT LEAVE
	64

IT OPEN TO THEM HOW MANY PEOPLE SHOULD BE IN THE 1 2 LEADERSHIP ROLE. AND I THINK THAT --3 DR. DULIEGE: UP TO THREE, NOT A CREW. 4 YEAH. 5 DR. CANET-AVILES: CHAIRMAN, AS THE LEAD 6 OF THE SCIENTIFIC GOVERNANCE, COULD I ADD ONE PIECE 7 OF INFORMATION? 8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, PLEASE. 9 DR. CANET-AVILES: SO, UTA, I JUST WANTED TO REMIND EVERYBODY THAT FOR THE PAST SHARED LABS, 10 WE DID NOT HAVE A MINIMUM REQUIREMENT. SO IN TERMS 11 OF MICROMANAGEMENT, WE HAVE NOT IMPOSED ANY MINIMUM 12 REQUIREMENT WHICH COULD BE ANOTHER CHOICE THAT WE 13 14 COULD HAVE. DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU. 15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DEBORAH. 16 17 DR. DEAS: YES. I'D LIKE TO SHARE THE PERSPECTIVE OF PAT. AND I REALLY BELIEVE THAT THERE 18 19 SHOULD BE A 10-PERCENT MINIMUM. THIS IS AN 20 IMPORTANT ROLE. AND FOR THE PERSON TO REALLY CONTRIBUTE SUBSTANTIVELY, I REALLY BELIEVE THAT 10 21 22 PERCENT SHOULD BE THE MINIMUM. AND I WOULD RECOMMEND AMENDING TO HAVE IT AT 10 PERCENT MINIMUM. 23 24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. MARV. 25 DR. SOUTHARD: I ALSO CONCUR. I THINK 65

1	PAT'S SUGGESTION OF 10 PERCENT IS A GOOD ONE.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. LARRY.
3	DR. GOLDSTEIN: I THINK THAT I WOULD
4	ENDORSE THE CIRM STAFF'S EXPERIENCE SINCE THEY'VE
5	HAD EXPERIENCE WITH THE RUNNING OF THE STEM CELL
6	CORE LABS. AND FOR A SCIENTIFIC LEADER AT THE LEVEL
7	OF SENIORITY THAT I THINK WE'D LIKE TO SEE
8	PARTICIPATE IN THESE SHARED LABS, 5 PERCENT AS A
9	MINIMUM STRIKES ME AS REASONABLE GIVEN WHAT I'VE
10	SEEN OVER THE YEARS. AND REMEMBER THAT THIS PERSON
11	IS PROVIDING A LITTLE BIT MORE VISION AND MUCH LESS
12	OF THE DAY-TO-DAY OPERATION. AND SO A SENIOR
13	SCIENTIST WHO RUNS THE DAY-TO-DAY OPERATIONS IS VERY
14	EXPERIENCED. AND WE ARE RELYING ON THAT SENIOR
15	PERSON MORE FOR VISION, NOT FOR THE HANDS-ON
16	MANAGEMENT OF THESE LABS.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LARRY, THANK YOU. PAT,
18	WOULD YOU LIKE TO RESPOND TO THAT?
19	DR. LEVITT: YEAH. SO I SEE THIS
20	EFFORT I THINK WE ARE ALL VERY STRONGLY ENDORSING
21	THIS, THE SHARED FACILITIES. THAT PLACES A LARGER
22	ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN ON INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE LEADING
23	AT THE VARIOUS CENTERS BECAUSE IT REQUIRES
24	ENGAGEMENT AND INTERACTION WITH OTHER CENTERS. AND
25	WHEN YOU'RE DOING IT WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF YOUR OWN

66

1	INSTITUTE, IT'S ONE THING. WHEN YOU'RE DOING IT IN
2	THE CONTEXT OF A NETWORK, I THINK THERE'S AN ADDED
3	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITIES.
4	AND SO 5 PERCENT TO OVERSEE THIS
5	ENGAGEMENT AND BEING PART OF THIS NETWORK IS GOING
6	TO REQUIRE MORE THAN JUST INTERNAL MEETINGS AND
7	INTERNAL MANAGEMENT OF QC. THE SUCCESS OF THIS IS
8	GOING TO DEPEND ON THE QUALITY THAT'S GENERATED AT
9	THESE INDIVIDUAL CENTERS. AND HOW THEY ENGAGE AND
10	INTERACT, ADDITIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, MAKING SURE
11	THAT MANAGEMENT, WHOEVER IS DOING THE DAILY
12	MANAGEMENT, UNDERSTANDS WHAT THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES
13	ARE. I JUST SEE THIS AS SOMETHING DIFFERENT THAN
14	WHAT HAS BEEN FUNDED IN THE PAST IN TERMS OF
15	INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONAL CORES. SO I JUST THINK 5
16	PERCENT, TWO HOURS A WEEK, AND WE UNDERSTAND THAT
17	IT'S NOT 40 HOURS, IT'S PROBABLY SIXTY HOURS, BUT
18	EVEN AT 5 PERCENT OF 60 HOURS, YOU'RE TALKING THREE
19	HOURS A WEEK. IT'S JUST NOT REALISTIC.
20	AND ALL OF US WHO ARE SENIOR LEADERS, HAVE
21	ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES AS WELL AS RUNNING
22	RESEARCH LABORATORIES, HAVE TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT
23	WHAT WE'RE GOING TO PUT OUR TIME INTO. AND IF
24	THEY'RE AT 95 PERCENT ON GRANTS, EXTRAMURAL GRANTS,
25	AND THEY ONLY HAVE 5 PERCENT OR THEY'RE AT 70 OR 80
	67

1	PERCENT AND THEY HAVE A LARGE ADMINISTRATIVE
2	RESPONSIBILITY, THAT'S A DECISION THAT THEY HAVE TO
3	MAKE.
4	AND I AGREE WITH THE SENTIMENT OF LOWERING
5	IT FROM 20 FOR SURE BECAUSE 20 WOULD PRECLUDE LOTS
6	OF SENIOR LEADERS FROM PARTICIPATING. BUT I DON'T
7	SEE 10 PERCENT BEING VERY RESTRICTIVE, AND I THINK
8	IT REFLECTS THE GREATER REALITY OF WHAT THEY WILL
9	NEED TO BE DOING.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, PAT. LARRY,
11	WOULD YOU CARE TO RESPOND TO THAT?
12	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. I GUESS MY
13	EXPERIENCE IS JUST DIFFERENT THAN PAT'S. I THINK
14	I'VE SEEN FOLKS WHO ARE AT THE LEVELS OF SENIORITY
15	AND ACCOMPLISHMENT THAT WE WANT WHO WOULD BE UNABLE
16	TO COMMIT MORE THAN 5 PERCENT. AND REMEMBER THAT
17	THESE ARE GOING TO BE REVIEWED BY THE GRANTS WORKING
18	GROUP. THEY'RE GOING TO REVIEW WHAT THE
19	ARRANGEMENTS ARE, AND I THINK WE SHOULD AVOID
20	MICROMANAGING TOO MUCH HERE. I THINK THE CIRM STAFF
21	HAVE DONE A GOOD JOB IN EVALUATING HOW BEST TO
22	PROCEED. AND THAT PLUS THE REVIEW OF WHAT THE
23	ARRANGEMENTS WOULD BE STRIKES ME AS NOT ONLY
24	ADEQUATE, BUT WILL HELP US ATTRACT THE VERY BEST
25	SCIENTIFIC LEADERS.

68

-	
1	I MEAN I'LL USE THE EXAMPLE OF A NAMELESS
2	PERSON AT STANFORD WHO IS HIGHLY RECOGNIZED IN THIS
3	FIELD WHO YOU WOULD LOVE TO ATTRACT TO PROVIDE THE
4	VISION AND LEADERSHIP FOR ONE OF THESE CORE LABS,
5	AND THE DAY-TO-DAY INTERNAL ADMINISTRATIVE
6	FUNCTIONS, ALL OF THE BUDGETING AND DEALING WITH
7	INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION, THAT'S DONE BY A
8	SENIOR SCIENTIST WHO'S THE RIGHT-HAND PERSON OF A
9	SCIENTIFIC OR MEDICAL LEADER.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DEBORAH, WOULD
11	YOU YOU'RE TAKING THIS IN. WOULD YOU LIKE TO
12	RESPOND TO THE LAST FEW COMMENTS PLEASE?
13	DR. DEAS: I HAVE NO CHANGE IN MY
14	RECOMMENDATION. I WOULD I STILL MAINTAIN THAT 10
15	PERCENT SHOULD BE A MINIMUM.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. KIM.
17	DR. BARRETT: I TEND TO AGREE WITH LARRY,
18	AND I THINK WE ALL KNOW THAT THERE WILL BE SOME
19	WEEKS WHEN IT'S 20 HOURS THAT THIS PERSON WILL
20	DEVOTE AND OTHER WEEKS WHERE THE THING IS JUST
21	ROLLING ALONG AND THEY DON'T HAVE TO DEVOTE ANY
22	TIME.
23	BUT I REALLY WANTED TO ASK WHETHER THIS
24	WAS A SORT OF DATA-DRIVEN PROCESS? WERE THESE
25	PERCENTAGES JUST ARRIVED AT OUT OF THE AIR, OR DID
	69
	•••

1 YOU HAVE EVIDENCE FROM THE FIELD THAT THE 5-PERG	
I TOO HAVE EVIDENCE FROM THE FIELD THAT THE J-PERG	ENI
2 NUMBER WAS THE RIGHT ONE, OR DID YOU HAVE SENIOR	R
3 PEOPLE TELLING YOU THAT THEY WOULD NOT BE ABLE	⁻ 0
4 APPLY WITH THE PREVIOUS STANDARD? I DO AGREE TH	IAT
5 20 PERCENT FOR A SINGLE PERSON WAS TOO MUCH.	
6 DR. GRIESHAMMER: SO THANK YOU. FOR F	ULL
7 DISCLOSURE, LOOKING AT THE ACTUAL PERCENT COMMIT	MENT
8 THAT PROGRAM DIRECTORS FOR THE PREVIOUS SHARED I	ABS
9 OFFERED, IT WAS BETWEEN 5 AND 10 PERCENT. AND 1	ΉE
10 CONCERN THAT WE WOULD BE EXCLUDING THE SENIOR	
11 LEADERS IN THE FIELD COMES FROM GENERAL EXPERIEN	ICES
12 THAT WE DO HAVE AS CIRM STAFF WHEN WE TALK TO TH	ΙEΜ,
13 FOR INSTANCE, ABOUT PROVIDING FOR OTHER AWARDS W	HERE
14 WE OFTEN REQUIRE 20-PERCENT EFFORT AND CONCERNS	THAT
15 THEY CANNOT COMMIT, THEY JUST DON'T HAVE THE ROO	ОМ ТО
16 OFFICIALLY COMMIT THAT AMOUNT OF TIME. AND SO	HOSE
17 TWO THINGS COMBINED LED US TO PROPOSE THE 5-PERC	ENT
18 MINIMUM.	
19 DR. BARRETT: IF I MIGHT ALSO FOLLOW U	JP.
20 SOME OF THE TIMES THE CONSIDERATION IS THAT THES	SE
21 SENIOR PEOPLE TEND TO HAVE MUCH HIGHER LEVELS OF	=
22 COMPENSATION FROM THE SCIENTIFIC SORT OF MANAGEM	IENT
23 FUNCTION. AND TO ASK THEM TO TAKE A MUCH LARGER	R
24 PERCENTAGE WILL (INAUDIBLE).	
25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ARE THERE OTH	IER
70	

1	
1	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? WE SEEM TO SORT
2	OF FROM THOSE COMMENTING, WE SEEM TO HAVE A
3	FAIRLY EVEN SPLIT BETWEEN FIVE AND TEN HERE. OTHER
4	THOUGHTS? FRED.
5	DR. MALKAS: LINDA MALKAS.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HI, LINDA. AND THEN
7	FRED.
8	DR. MALKAS: IT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT WHAT
9	I'M GOING TO SAY HERE, BUT WHEN I PUT IN OUR GRANTS,
10	WE PUT IN A LOT OF GRANTS, I ONLY PUT IN 5 PERCENT
11	ON THE GRANTS. AND ACTUALLY NONE OF THE FUNDING
12	AGENCIES EVER BLINK AN EYE. I KNOW THIS IS
13	DIFFERENT THAN WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE. MY
14	SALARY WOULD BE PART OF THE GRANT, BUT IT'S KIND OF
15	LIKE AN UNSPOKEN THING THROUGHOUT THE SCIENTIFIC
16	ENTERPRISE. I DON'T KNOW IF I SHOULD EVEN BE
17	REVEALING THIS, BUT HAVING 5 PERCENT ON THERE
18	PROBABLY MEANS THAT I'M PUTTING PROBABLY 25 OR 50
19	PERCENT OF MY TIME REALLY TOWARDS WHATEVER THAT
20	ACTIVITY IS. A PERSON WHO IS THAT IS DOING THIS
21	UNDERSTANDS, VERY LIKELY UNDERSTANDS, THE
22	RESPONSIBILITY.
23	SO THE DISCUSSION OF THE EFFORT PIECE
24	HERE, I WORK I DO A LOT WITH A LOT OF THE
25	DIFFERENT FEDERAL AGENCIES, AND IT'S JUST KIND OF
	71

1	UNDERSTOOD THAT YOU'RE GOING TO PUT IN WHAT YOU HAVE
2	TO PUT IN. AND WHETHER IT'S 5 OR 10 PERCENT IS
3	REALLY IT'S NOT YOU'RE GOING TO GET THE JOB
4	DONE. I GUESS THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO JUST SAY. SO
5	IF YOU ARE AIMING FOR A VERY HIGH LEVEL PERSON TO DO
6	THIS, THEIR TIME SOMEBODY MADE THE COMMENT THAT
7	MAYBE WE WON'T GET AS HIGH AN ACHIEVER AS WE WOULD
8	LIKE BY ASKING THIS HIGHER LEVEL OF COMMITMENT. BUT
9	EVEN IF THEY SAY THEY'RE GOING TO DO 5 PERCENT, I
10	COULD ALMOST GUARANTEE THAT WHOEVER TAKES THE ROLE
11	WILL BE PUTTING IN WAY MORE EFFORT THAN 5 PERCENT.
12	I WOULDN'T WANT TO HAVE THIS PERCENT EFFORT THING BE
13	USED OR BE A DETERRENT TO GETTING THE BEST PERSON
14	THAT YOU CAN FOR THIS. THAT'S ALL I WANT TO SAY.
15	THANK YOU.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, LINDA. FRED.
17	DR. FISHER: J.T., SINCE YOU'RE ASKING FOR
18	TIEBREAKERS, I WAS GOING TO BREAK THE TIE AND GO
19	WITH THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION AND THE MOTION
20	THAT'S CURRENTLY ON THE TABLE. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT
21	THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO HOURS A WEEK AND FOUR
22	HOURS A WEEK, WHICH TO ME IS IMMATERIAL IN THE REAL
23	WORLD. I UNDERSTAND HOW 10 PERCENT SENDS A MESSAGE
24	IN TERMS OF THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE THAT WE PLACE ON
25	THE ENGAGEMENT OF THAT PERSON, BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT

72

1	THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TWO AND FOUR HOURS IS GOING
2	TO, FROM A PRACTICAL POINT OF VIEW, MAKE THAT
3	CHANGE.
4	AND FROM THE OTHER FROM SORT OF A MORE
5	FISCAL POINT OF VIEW, MAKING PROJECTS MORE EXPENSIVE
6	BY INCREASING THE TIME OF THAT PERSON, WHICH
7	BASICALLY PUTS MORE MONEY MOVES MONEY SORT OF
8	AWAY FROM THE DIRECT SCIENCE THAT WE ARE LOOKING TO
9	FUND AND MORE IN THE ADMIN SIDE, I'M NOT SURE THAT'S
10	A GOOD THING EITHER. SO I WILL HELP ADD WEIGHT TO
11	THE IDEA OF STICKING WITH THE CURRENT MOTION AND
12	GOING ALONG WITH THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. DAVID.
14	DR. HIGGINS: YEAH. I JUST I'M LAST IN
15	LINE HERE. I JUST WANTED TO SECOND WHAT ANNE-MARIE
16	FIRST BROUGHT UP AND WHAT LARRY EXPANDED ON AND WHAT
17	FRED JUST TALKED ABOUT. AND THAT IS LET'S LET OUR
18	STAFF BE THE STAFF. LET THEM DO THE JOB. AND WE
19	CAN ALWAYS CHANGE IT. WE CAN ALWAYS THEY'VE GOT
20	REASONS FOR WHAT THEY'VE COME UP WITH. AND IF IT
21	DOESN'T WORK, WE CAN CHANGE IT. SO I WOULD JUST
22	SECOND THE MOTION OF STICKING WITH THE STAFF
23	RECOMMENDATION.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ANNE-MARIE.
25	DR. DULIEGE: YEAH. IN FACT, I'M SAYING
	73

1	EXACTLY THE SAME. WITH THE BENEFIT OF UTA'S
2	EXPLANATIONS AND THE DISCUSSION, I THINK I CANNOT
3	COME WITH A BETTER PROPOSAL THAN THE ONE THAT YOU
4	SUGGESTED AND THAT IS ON THE SLIDE, UTA.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. PAT.
6	DR. LEVITT: YEAH. I JUST WANT TO SAY
7	THAT WHAT FRED SAID, I THINK, IS REALLY IMPORTANT.
8	THERE'S NO DOUBT THAT ALL OF US WHO ARE PI'S ON
9	GRANTS PUT IN MUCH MORE TIME THAN WHAT WE ARE
10	ALLOTTED. AND MOST OF US WHO ARE SENIOR ARE MAKING
11	ABOVE THE NIH CAP ANYWAY. SO THAT'S NOT THE ISSUE.
12	AND THE ISSUE IN TERMS OF COST TO THE
13	GRANT BETWEEN 5 AND 10 PERCENT IS TRIVIAL. THAT'S
14	NOT GOING TO IMPACT THE ABILITY OF THE PROJECT TO BE
15	COMPLETED, BUT IT DOES SEND A MESSAGE OF WHAT'S
16	EXPECTED BETWEEN 5 AND 10 PERCENT. AND THERE'S A
17	DIFFERENCE THERE'S JUST A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION.
18	PROGRAM OFFICERS AT NIH, AT LEAST THE ONES THAT I'VE
19	INTERACTED WITH, AT MANY INSTITUTIONS, AT MANY OF
20	THE INSTITUTES FIND 5 PERCENT FOR A PI TO BE LESS
21	THAN OPTIMAL IN TERMS OF AT LEAST A PSYCHOSOCIAL
22	COMMITMENT TO THIS.
23	CAN I ASK ONE OTHER QUESTION? SO THIS 5
24	PERCENT WOULD APPLY TO EXISTING CORES FOR THAT GROUP
25	AS WELL AS THE 5 PERCENT MINIMUM FOR THE PI OF AN
	74

APPLICATION COMING FROM A NEW SITE? 1 DR. GRIESHAMMER: THE WAY IT'S ENVISIONED 2 3 RIGHT NOW, YES. DR. LEVITT: SO THERE'S A SENSE THAT 4 5-PERCENT EFFORT, IF YOU'RE STARTING A NEW CORE AT A 5 6 NEW SITE, WOULD BE SUFFICIENT? DR. GRIESHAMMER: WELL, WE WOULD ACTUALLY 7 REQUIRE -- IF THE APPLICANT PROGRAM DIRECTOR CAME IN 8 9 WITH A REQUEST FOR 5 PERCENT, WE WOULD REQUIRE THAT THE SECOND LEADERSHIP ROLE BE AT LEAST 15 PERCENT. 10 SO IT'S THE TEAM TOGETHER WITH THE 20 PERCENT, BUT 11 THEY COULD DIVIDE THE PERCENTAGE DIFFERENTLY. BUT, 12 13 YEAH, I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT WE ARE EXPECTING A 14 LEADERSHIP TEAM -- THE LEADERSHIP TEAM TO HAVE AT LEAST 20 PERCENT TOGETHER. 15 DR. LEVITT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I'M FINE 16 WITH THAT IF IT'S BEING UNIFORMLY APPLIED. I DIDN'T 17 WANT TO SEE DIFFERENTIAL DIFFERENCES IN HOW THIS WAS 18 19 GOING TO BE APPLIED. I AGREE WITH THE 5 PERCENT, BUT I'M HAPPY TO GO FORWARD WITH THE AMENDMENT AS IT 20 IS. 21 22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. LET ME ASK IS THERE ANYBODY THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE AN AMENDMENT 23 24 TO THE AMENDMENT, AS IT WERE, BECAUSE, IF SO, I WANT 25 MR. TOCHER TO WALK US THROUGH WHAT THAT PROCESS

75

1	WOULD MEAN. SO DOES ANYBODY WANT TO AMEND THE
2	MOTION? OKAY. WELL, HEARING THAT, I THINK, FIRST
3	OF ALL, THANK YOU. THAT WAS AN EXCELLENT DISCUSSION
4	ON THE TOPIC. VERY IMPORTANT PERSPECTIVES BROUGHT
5	TO BEAR. SO HEARING NO REQUESTS TO AMEND, ANY OTHER
6	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AT THIS POINT? ANY
7	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE NONE.
9	CONTROLLER YEE: THANK YOU. MARIA, WILL
10	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
12	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMAD ABOUSALEM.
14	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
16	DR. BARRETT: AYE.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
18	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
20	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN. LINDA
22	BOXER.
23	DR. BOXER: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
25	DR. CHOU: CAN I SKIP THIS ONE BECAUSE I
	76
	, o

1	JUST LOG IN?	
2	MS.	BONNEVILLE: OF COURSE. LEONDRA.
3	CLARK-HARVEY.	
4	DR.	CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
5	MS.	BONNEVILLE: 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: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
12	FRED FISHER.	
13	DR.	FISHER: YES.
14	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
15	DR.	FLOWERS: YES.
16	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
17	DR.	GASSON: YES.
18	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
19	DR.	GOLDSTEIN: YES.
20	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
21	DR.	HIGGINS: YES.
22	MS.	BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
23	MR.	JUELSGAARD: YES.
24	MS.	BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. PAT LEVITT.
25	DR.	LEVITT: CAN I ABSTAIN?
		77

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU CAN.
2	DR. LEVITT: OKAY. I ABSTAIN.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
4	DR. MALKAS: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
6	DR. MELMED: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
8	LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
9	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
11	DR. PADILLA: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
13	MR. PANETTA: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
15	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
17	DR. SELICK: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
19	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
21	DR. SANDMEYER: SUZANNE SANDMEYER VOTING
22	YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, SUZANNE.
24	JONATHAN THOMAS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
	78
	/ 0

-	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
2	MR. TORRES: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
4	THE MOTION CARRIES.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. LAST
6	ACTION ITEM BEFORE CLOSED SESSION IS CONSIDERATION
7	OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY FOR THE
8	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.
9	PRESENTATION BY MR. TOCHER.
10	MR. TOCHER: THANKS VERY MUCH, J.T. AND
11	GOOD IT'S STILL MORNING GOOD MORNING,
12	EVERYONE.
13	SO THIS IS REALLY LARGELY A HOUSEKEEPING
14	MATTER. AS YOU KNOW, THIS BOARD'S WORK IS ASSISTED
15	IN PART BY THE ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
16	INSTITUTE'S FORMAL WORKING GROUPS. AND THEY ARE, AS
17	YOU ARE PROBABLY AWARE, THE GRANTS, FACILITIES, AND
18	THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUPS. AND, OF COURSE,
19	PROPOSITION 14 ADDED A FOURTH WORKING GROUP, THE
20	ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.
21	NOW, THE LAW HAS DECLARED THAT, BECAUSE
22	THESE WORKING GROUPS ARE PURELY ADVISORY TO THE
23	BOARD, THE STATE'S CONFLICT OF INTEREST LAWS DO NOT
24	APPLY TO THE NON-ICOC MEMBERS OF THESE WORKING
25	GROUPS. HOWEVER, TO ENSURE THE INTEGRITY OF THE
	79

79

1	ADVICE OF THESE GROUPS, THE BOARD IS RESPONSIBLE FOR
2	ADOPTING ITS OWN CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICIES AND
3	APPLY THEM TO THE NON-ICOC MEMBERS OF THOSE GROUPS.
4	AND THE BOARD HAS FULFILLED THAT RESPONSIBILITY WITH
5	RESPECT TO THE FIRST THREE WORKING GROUPS THAT I
6	MENTIONED THAT WERE ESTABLISHED BY PROP 71.
7	SO THE PURPOSE OF THIS ITEM, THEN, IS TO
8	ADOPT AN INTERIM COI POLICY TO APPLY TO THE AAWG AND
9	TO AUTHORIZE THE CIRM TEAM TO INITIATE THE PROCESS
10	FOR MAKING PERMANENT THESE COI RULES. SO WHAT WE
11	DID IN DRAFTING THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR THIS
12	POLICY WAS, IN A SENSE, STARTING AT GROUND ZERO. WE
13	RELIED UPON WORK THAT THE BOARD UNDERTOOK BACK IN
14	2016 WHEN IT UPDATED AND REVISED THE COI RULES THAT
15	APPLY TO OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND WE PROPOSE
16	TODAY TO LEVERAGE THAT WORK BY MODELING THIS POLICY
17	FOR THE AAWG CLOSELY ON THE ONE APPLICABLE TO THE
18	GRANTS WORKING GROUP. BECAUSE BOTH GROUPS CONSIDER
19	RECOMMENDATIONS, AMONG OTHER THINGS, REGARDING
20	SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDS OR CONTRACTS, WE
21	BELIEVE THAT IT'S BEST THAT THE AAWG'S POLICIES
22	MIRROR THOSE OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AS WELL.
23	NOW, THESE RULES WILL BE FAIRLY INTUITIVE
24	IN APPLICATION AS ARE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP'S AND
25	WILL IDENTIFY FINANCIAL INTERESTS THAT WOULD
	80

80

1	DISQUALIFY MEMBERS FROM PARTICIPATING IN
2	CONSIDERATION OF AN APPLICATION OR CONTRACT IN THE
3	EVENT THAT THE MEMBER HAS A CONFLICT. THE ICOC HAS
4	GENERALLY DEFINED POTENTIAL CONFLICTS FOR OUR
5	WORKING GROUP MEMBERS ACCORDING TO THREE TYPES.
6	THOSE ARE FINANCIAL, PERSONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL.
7	SO, FOR INSTANCE, IF A NON-ICOC MEMBER OR
8	THEIR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER IS AN EMPLOYEE OF AN
9	APPLICANT ORGANIZATION OR IS A KEY PERSON ON THE
10	APPLICATION OR IS SOMEHOW PROMISED INCOME ABOVE A
11	CERTAIN THRESHOLD FROM THE APPLICANT, THEN A
12	CONFLICT WILL EXIST AND THE MEMBER WILL BE PRECLUDED
13	FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE CONSIDERATION OF THAT
14	AWARD.
15	A PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT WOULD ARISE WHERE
16	THE MEMBER AND AN INDIVIDUAL ON THE APPLICATION ARE
17	ENGAGED IN OR PLANNING TO ENGAGE IN A JOINT PROJECT
18	OF SOME SORT.
19	AND A PERSONAL CONFLICT WILL BE PRESENT
20	WHERE THE IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER OR A CLOSE
21	PERSONAL FRIEND IS A PERSON LISTED ON THE
22	APPLICATION AS A KEY PERSONNEL OR WHERE THE MEMBER
23	AND A PERSON LISTED ON THE APPLICATION HAVE BEEN ON
24	OPPOSING SIDES IN A LAWSUIT OR SIMILAR DISPUTE.
25	AS PART OF THE PROCESS, PRIOR TO
	81

1	CONSIDERATION OF AN APPLICATION, A MODULE WILL BE
2	SET UP IN OUR GRANTS REVIEW PROCESS THAT WILL
3	IDENTIFY KEY INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR AN
4	APPLICATION, AND MEMBERS WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY
5	TO REVIEW THAT LIST AND IDENTIFY POTENTIAL CONFLICTS
6	IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
7	AS CONTAINED IN OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP
8	POLICY, THIS ALSO CONTAINS A SPECIAL EXEMPTION
9	PROCESS WHEREBY, IF THE PRESIDENT FINDS THAT THE
10	NEED FOR SPECIAL EXPERTISE OF AN INDIVIDUAL MEMBER
11	WHO OTHERWISE HAS A CONFLICT, WHERE THAT NEED
12	OUTWEIGHS A POTENTIAL BIAS, THE MEMBER MAY
13	PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION, BUT WILL NOT BE
14	PERMITTED TO VOTE ON OR SCORE THAT MATTER. I CAN
15	TELL YOU THAT HISTORICALLY THAT EXCEPTION HAS ONLY
16	VERY RARELY BEEN UTILIZED.
17	SO THE ADVANTAGE ALSO OF FOLLOWING SORT OF
18	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP POLICY AS A MODEL IS THAT
19	RECENTLY, RELATIVELY RECENTLY IN 2016, WE WENT
20	THROUGH THE ADOPTION PROCESS OF THE OFFICE OF
21	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, WHICH IS A STATE AGENCY THAT
22	REVIEWS OUR POLICIES BEFORE THEY BECOME OFFICIAL
23	REGULATIONS. THIS CAN BE A VERY IN-DEPTH REVIEW.
24	IT IS AN IN-DEPTH REVIEW. AND THIS POLICY HAS THE
25	BENEFIT OF HAVING GONE THROUGH THAT OAL PROCESS AND

1	BEEN APPROVED BY THE OAL. SO WE HAVE A TRACK RECORD
2	WITH THIS LANGUAGE PASSING MUSTER WITH OAL.
3	SO WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING THEN GO TO THE
4	NEXT SLIDE IS TO ADOPT THE LANGUAGE ON AN INTERIM
5	BASIS TO BE EFFECTIVE JANUARY 15TH, NEXT MONTH,
6	WHILE AUTHORIZING US TO SIMULTANEOUSLY BEGIN THE
7	FORMAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ADOPTION PROCESS
8	THROUGH OAL IN ORDER TO PERMANENTLY ADOPT CONCEPT
9	RULES. THIS WILL NOT BE THE LAST TIME THE BOARD
10	WOULD SEE ANY LANGUAGE. WE WOULD BRING THIS BACK AT
11	THE CONCLUSION OF THE OAL PROCESS TO DISCUSS ANY
12	POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS OR PUBLIC COMMENT THAT WE
13	RECEIVED DURING THAT PROCESS.
14	I KNOW THAT'S A BIT OF A MOUTHFUL ON
15	PROCESS ISSUES, BUT I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
16	QUESTIONS.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MR. TOCHER.
18	DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
19	DR. ABOUSALEM: I'LL MAKE THE MOTION.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LET'S SEE. I THINK
21	SENATOR TORRES, SECONDED BY MOHAMMED. QUESTIONS OR
22	COMMENTS OF MR. TOCHER?
23	MR. TORRES: YES.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ART.
25	MR. TORRES: SCOTT, I WANT TO THANK YOU
	83

1	FOR ALL THE WORK YOU PUT INTO THIS AND TO MAKE SURE
2	THAT WE ARE CONSISTENT WITH ALL OUR GENERAL POLICIES
3	OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. AS THE AUTHOR OF THIS
4	LANGUAGE IN THE NEW INITIATIVE WITH BOB KLEIN, IT
5	WAS VERY IMPORTANT FOR US TO MAKE SURE THAT THE
6	CONSISTENCY WAS GOING TO OCCUR, NOT ONLY IN TERMS OF
7	RULEMAKING AND THE NEED FOR CONFLICT OF INTEREST
8	REGULATIONS, BUT I'M GLAD YOU'VE TAKEN THE TIME
9	BECAUSE I KNOW HOW MUCH TIME IT TAKES TO GO THROUGH
10	ALL THE AOL AND OTHER AGENCIES THAT BELEAGUER ANY
11	STATE AGENCY, BUT CLEARLY YOU'VE DONE A VERY GOOD
12	JOB. AND I WANT TO THANK YOU AGAIN FOR PUTTING THIS
13	INTO MOTION.
14	MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ART. OTHER
16	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? ANY
17	PUBLIC COMMENT?
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE'S NO PUBLIC
19	COMMENT.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE
21	CALL THE ROLL.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
23	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMAD ABOUSALEM.
25	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
	84

-	
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
2	DR. BARRETT: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
4	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
6	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN. LINDA
8	BOXER.
9	DR. BOXER: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
11	DR. CHOU: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
13	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
15	DR. DEAS: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
17	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
19	MS. DURON: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
21	FRED FISHER.
22	DR. FISHER: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
24	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
	85
	J

	,
1	DR. GASSON: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
3	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
5	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
7	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. PAT LEVITT.
9	DR. LEVITT: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
11	DR. MALKAS: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
13	DR. MELMED: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
15	LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
16	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
18	DR. PADILLA: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
20	MR. PANETTA: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
22	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
24	DR. SELICK: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
	86
	00

	-
1	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
3	DR. STAMOS: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
7	MR. TORRES: AYE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
9	THE MOTION CARRIES.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU, MARIA.
11	WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK. AND WHEN
12	WE RECONVENE, WE WILL THEN TURN TO KAREN GETMAN TO
13	READ US THE APPROPRIATE LANGUAGE FOR ADJOURNING TO A
14	CLOSED SESSION. SO BACK IN FIVE, EVERYBODY. SINCE
15	IT'S 10:54, LET'S MAKE IT AN EVEN TOP OF THE HOUR.
16	THANK YOU.
17	(A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. IT'S 11 O'CLOCK.
19	WE ARE RECONVENED. KAREN, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO GIVE
20	US INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADJOURNING TO CLOSED SESSION
21	PLEASE.
22	MS. GETMAN: THANK YOU. WE ARE MOVING
23	INTO CLOSED SESSION FOR A DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL
24	AND IN PARTICULAR THE COMPENSATION FOR CIRM'S CEO
25	AND PRESIDENT. THAT IS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE
	87

1	SECTION 11.26(A) AND HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION
2	125290.30(F)(3)(D).
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. DOUG
4	IS TAKING US INTO THE BREAK-OUT ROOM. SO EVERYBODY
5	COULD CLICK JOIN, AND WE WILL SEE YOU IN A SECOND.
6	(THE BOARD THEN WENT INTO CLOSED
7	SESSION, NOT REPORTED NOR HEREIN TRANSCRIBED. AT
8	THE CONCLUSION OF THE CLOSED SESSION, THE FOLLOWING
9	WAS THEN HEARD IN OPEN SESSION.)
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. THE
11	BOARD IS RECONVENING FROM CLOSED SESSION. AND WE
12	HAVE A MOTION TO ENTERTAIN FOR THE BOARD WITH
13	RESPECT TO ITEM NO. 14, AS THE BULLET POINT NOTES,
14	COMPENSATION FOR CIRM'S CEO. SO WE WANT TO HAVE A
15	MOTION THAT WE HAVE A MERIT INCREASE OF 3 PERCENT
16	ABOVE CURRENT SALARY FOR MARIA, WHICH TAKES US TO A
17	TOTAL OF IF SOMEBODY CAN DO THE MATH VERY
18	QUICKLY
19	MS. GETMAN: 583,490 IS WHAT I GOT.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THE
21	NUMBER THE MOTION IS TO INCREASE MARIA'S SALARY,
22	WHICH IS ABOVE THE MEDIAN THAT WE DISCUSSED AT AN
23	EARLIER MEETING, UP TO THE NUMBER THAT KAREN JUST
24	INDICATED. IS THERE A SECOND FOR THAT?
25	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
	88

MR. TORRES: SECOND. 1 2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE DISCUSSION FROM 3 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? MS. BONNEVILLE: IS THAT ANNE-MARIE AND 4 5 ART? I'M SORRY. DR. DULIEGE: DOESN'T MATTER, YEAH. 6 7 EITHER/OR. MS. BONNEVILLE: BOTH. OKAY. GREAT. 8 9 THANK YOU. CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY DISCUSSION FROM 10 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? 11 MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY HANDS 12 13 RAISED. CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THAT BEING THE 14 CASE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL. 15 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. 16 17 DR. ABDULHAQ: YES. MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMAD ABOUSALEM. 18 19 DR. ABOUSALEM: YES. 20 MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT. DR. BARRETT: AYE. 21 22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE BLUMENTHAL. MICHAEL BOTCHAN. LINDA BOXER. 23 DR. BOXER: YES. 24 25 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

89

1	DR. CHOU: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
3	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
5	DR. DEAS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
7	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
9	MS. DURON: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
11	FRED FISHER.
12	DR. FISHER: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
14	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
16	DR. GASSON: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
18	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
20	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
22	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. PAT LEVITT.
24	DR. LEVITT: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
	90

	,
1	DR. MALKAS: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED. LAUREN
3	MILLER-ROGEN.
4	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
6	DR. PADILLA: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA. AL ROWLETT.
8	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
10	DR. SELICK: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
12	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
14	DR. STAMOS: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18	MR. TORRES: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
20	MOTION CARRIES.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. I BELIEVE
22	MARIA MILLAN'S VIDEO IS NOT WORKING. BUT, MARIA, IF
23	YOU'RE ON THE PHONE, YOU WANTED TO COMMENT?
24	DR. MILLAN: I JUST WANTED TO THANK THE
25	BOARD VERY MUCH FOR THIS MERIT INCREASE. IT'S MY
	91

1	HONOR TO SERVE IN THIS ROLE. THANK YOU SO MUCH.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. OKAY.
3	ON TO ITEM NO. 15, CONSIDERATION OF
4	COMPENSATION OH, NO. SORRY. WRONG THING.
5	SORRY. WHERE AM I HERE? UPDATES FROM THE
6	ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.
7	MR. TORRES: I THINK SEAN TURBEVILLE IS
8	GOING TO BE DOING THAT.
9	DR. TURBEVILLE: YES, SIR. I AM HERE.
10	UNFORTUNATELY I CAN'T SHOW MY VIDEO RIGHT NOW. I'M
11	LOCKED OUT. MARIA
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU JUST HAVE TO TURN
13	YOUR CAMERA BACK ON. THAT'S ALL.
14	DR. TURBEVILLE: THE HOST HAS STOPPED IT.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU'RE THERE.
16	DR. TURBEVILLE: LOVELY. ALL RIGHT. LET
17	ME GO AHEAD AND START MY SLIDES. ALL RIGHT.
18	WELL, GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYBODY. IN
19	ADDITION TO THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, FOR THE
20	OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THIS UPDATE. IN ADDITION TO
21	GEOFF LOMAX'S PRESENTATION ON THE STANDARDS WORKING
22	GROUP, WHICH WAS ONE OF OUR INITIATIVES, I'M GOING
23	TO PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON TWO OTHER INITIATIVES,
24	WORKSTREAMS THAT WE HAVE KICKED OFF IN MEDICAL
25	AFFAIRS.

1	SO ONE OF THE UPDATES IS TO THE ICOC, AND
2	THAT IS GIVE AN UPDATE ON THE CCE, THE COMMUNITY
3	CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, LISTENING SESSION
4	RECENTLY THAT TOOK PLACE AT UCSF FRESNO. I DO WANT
5	TO PAUSE HERE AND IMMEDIATELY ACKNOWLEDGE UCSF,
6	PARTICULARLY VINCE SMILEY AS WELL AS OUR GROUP ON
7	THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS SIDE. IT WAS A FAIRLY HEAVY
8	LIFT AND A VERY GOOD SESSION, BUT IT WAS A FAIRLY
9	QUICK ONE AND SUCCESSFUL. SO CERTAINLY WANT TO GIVE
10	DUE DILIGENCE TO ALL THE HEAVY LIFT THAT GOT US TO
11	THAT SESSION.
12	AND THEN SECOND, I WANT TO INTRODUCE AND
13	KICK OFF OUR ROAD MAP FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY.
14	SO AS A REFRESHER, ONE OF OUR FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC
15	GOALS IS TO CREATE AND LAUNCH THE COMMUNITY CARE
16	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE THAT SUPPORT DIVERSE PATIENT
17	PARTICIPATION IN THE RAPIDLY GROWING REGENERATIVE
18	MEDICINE LANDSCAPE. SO IN TANDEM WITH THE ALPHA
19	CLINIC, NOW WE HAVE NINE, THESE COMMUNITY CARE
20	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE WILL PROVIDE A CLINICAL
21	INFRASTRUCTURE FOR RESEARCH, TRAINING, PROGRAMS, AND
22	OUTREACH TO BEST SERVE PATIENTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN
23	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TRIALS OR RECEIVE APPROVED
24	TREATMENTS IN THE COMMUNITY AND PARTICULARLY IN
25	RURAL AREAS.

1	SO IN ORDER TO PREPARE FOR THIS IMPORTANT
2	PROGRAM, WE BEGAN CREATING SEVERAL REGIONAL
3	LISTENING SESSIONS FOR INFORMATION GATHERING. SO
4	THAT IS WE ASKED THE COMMUNITY TO GIVE US GUIDANCE
5	ON WHAT THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE
6	PROGRAMS SHOULD LOOK LIKE, WHAT ARE THE NEEDS, WHAT
7	ARE THE CLINICAL NEEDS, WHAT ARE THE COMMUNITY
8	NEEDS, AND WE'LL TAKE THAT FEEDBACK INTO THE AAWG
9	WITH RESPECT TO DOWN THE ROAD DEVELOPING A CONCEPT
10	PLAN. SO THROUGH THESE LISTENING SESSIONS, WE ARE
11	AIMING TO DEVELOP A DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN WITH THE AAWG
12	TO PRESENT TO THE ICOC FOR A FINAL APPROVAL IN JUNE
13	OF 2023.
14	SO THIS SLIDE SHOWS THE THREE AREAS THAT
15	WE WERE TARGETING WITH RESPECT TO THE CONCEPT PLAN.
16	ONE, UNDERSTAND THE CAPACITIES OF REGIONAL PROVIDERS
17	TO SUPPORT CLINICAL RESEARCH. TWO, IDENTIFY
18	WORKFORCE TRAINING NEEDS TO SUPPORT PATIENTS IN
19	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. AND THREE, IDENTIFY
20	OPPORTUNITIES TO PARTNER WITH COMMUNITY-BASED
21	ORGANIZATIONS. AND AGAIN, THE ULTIMATE GOAL IS TO
22	CREATE A NEW MECHANISM WITH THE CONCEPT PLAN FOR
23	ORGANIZATIONS TO APPLY FOR FUNDING FOR THIS
24	PARTICULAR PROGRAM.
25	SO ON OCTOBER 25TH MEDICAL AFFAIRS KICKED
	94

-	
1	OFF OUR FIRST LISTENING SESSION AT THE FRESNO/CLOVIS
2	UCSF FACILITY. THIS WAS CONSIDERED AN ENTHUSIASTIC
3	MEETING WHERE WE HAD ABOUT 30 PARTICIPANTS WHICH
4	INCLUDED HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS, INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED
5	IN WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, AND ALSO COMMUNITY MEMBERS
6	WITH THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEEDS AND CAPACITIES
7	OF PROVIDERS, THE CLINIC, THE WORKFORCE, AND THE
8	COMMUNITY.
9	SO THIS SLIDE SUMMARIZED SOME OF THE KEY
10	TAKEAWAYS, AND THIS IS PRELIMINARY. WE CATEGORIZED
11	THIS INTO THREE BUCKETS: ONE, CLINICAL READINESS;
12	TWO, TRAINING; AND THREE, INCREASE PATIENT ACCESS.
13	SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE LEARNED, AND
14	I'D LIKE TO, INSTEAD OF GOING THROUGH EACH ONE OF
15	THESE COMPONENTS, GIVE YOU A HIGH LEVEL TAKE-HOME
16	MESSAGE FOR WHAT WE LEARNED FROM THIS MEETING. SO
17	ONE THING THAT WE LEARNED FROM THE FRESNO EXPERIENCE
18	WAS THAT THERE WAS A COMPREHENSIVE INFRASTRUCTURE
19	ALREADY TO SUPPORT THE CLINICAL RESEARCH. IN
20	ADDITION, THEY WERE EAGER TO COLLABORATE WITH OUR
21	ALPHA CLINICS NETWORKS. AND THERE WERE A NUMBER OF
22	POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES AND COLLABORATIONS WHICH WE
23	COULD TAKE BACK TO THE AAWG.
24	WHAT WE OBSERVED WAS THAT THE MAIN
25	TAKEAWAY WAS NOT THAT THEY FELT THEY NEEDED THE
	95

1	INFRASTRUCTURE. IT WAS THE KNOW-HOW AND THE
2	METHODOLOGY AND THE TRAINING AND THE ABILITY TO
3	SUPPORT A NETWORK WITHIN OUR EXISTING CLINICAL
4	SITES.
5	ANOTHER STRONG THEME THAT EMERGED WAS
6	CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION AS THE PHYSICIANS FELT
7	THAT THERE WAS STILL VERY LIMITED KNOWLEDGE ABOUT
8	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, CELL AND GENE THERAPY. AND
9	FOR MANY OF YOU WHO HAVE JUST PROBABLY RETURNED FROM
10	ASH, WE ARE STILL TRYING TO DOWNLOAD ALL OF THE
11	INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED ON CELL AND GENE
12	THERAPIES. THERE'S A TON OF INFORMATION OUT THERE.
13	ONE OF THE SUGGESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE
14	HERE WAS TO WORK WITH THE CALIFORNIA MEDICAL
15	ASSOCIATION TO BRING EDUCATION AND VISIBILITY TO THE
16	TYPES OF PROGRAMS WE ARE SUPPORTING.
17	ANOTHER, FOR INSTANCE, WAS HOW PHYSICIANS
18	REFER PATIENTS TO LOCAL SITES AND CLINICAL TRIALS.
19	AND FINALLY, JUST AS IMPORTANT, HOW WE
20	ENGAGE WITH THE CLINICAL COMMUNITY-BASED
21	ORGANIZATIONS TO NOT ONLY LISTEN, BUT TO ALSO GAIN
22	THE TRUST AT THE LOCAL COMMUNITY LEVEL.
23	SO IN RETROSPECT, THIS WAS A PILOT
24	PROGRAM. THIS WAS SORT OF OUR FIRST RODEO, IF YOU
25	WILL. WE DID GET QUITE A BIT OF FEEDBACK. I THINK
	96

1	IT WAS A SUCCESSFUL PILOT PROGRAM, PROVIDED GOOD
2	FEEDBACK ON OUR APPROACH FOR OUR NEXT MEETINGS THAT
3	ARE GOING TO TAKE PLACE IN THE NEXT TWO MONTHS. SO
4	WE ARE PLANNING TWO MORE MEETINGS, ONE IN RIVERSIDE
5	AND THE OTHER IN REDDING/SHASTA AREA. THERE ARE
6	SUGGESTIONS ABOUT PERHAPS OTHER. ONE OF THE CAVEATS
7	HERE WITH THIS INFORMATION IS THAT IT MAY NOT BE
8	GENERALIZABLE TO OBVIOUSLY ALL OF CALIFORNIA, AND
9	THAT'S WHY WE ARE GOING AFTER OTHER GEOGRAPHICAL
10	AREAS TO ASK THE SAME QUESTIONS AND, AGAIN, TO
11	CONCATENATE ALL THIS INFORMATION OVER TIME AND
12	PRESENT IT TO THE AAWG.
13	AND THEN FINALLY, WE MAY PRESENT OR AT
14	LEAST CONSIDER A FINAL PROGRAM FOR A PUBLIC WORKSHOP
15	TO SUMMARIZE OUR FINDINGS FROM ALL OF THESE
16	LISTENING SESSIONS. SO THAT IS THE MAIN TAKE-HOME
17	MESSAGE FROM OUR RECENT COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF
18	EXCELLENCE. I THINK RIGHT NOW PERHAPS, MR.
19	CHAIRMAN, I'LL PAUSE TO SEE IF THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS
20	OR COMMENTS ABOUT THAT PROGRAM.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, SEAN. I'D
22	JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT DR. PADILLA AND I WERE AT
23	THIS MEETING ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD ALONG WITH GEOFF
24	LOMAX, WHO LED THE DISCUSSION, DID A VERY GOOD JOB.
25	MARIA BONNEVILLE WAS THERE AS WELL AND OTHER MEMBERS
	97

1	OF THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS TEAM WITH SEAN. THERE WAS
2	TREMENDOUS ENTHUSIASM VOICED BY EVERY SINGLE
3	PARTICIPANT ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF THE COMMUNITY CARE
4	CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE. AND THEY ARE EAGERLY LOOKING
5	FORWARD TO HAVING THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY AT SUCH
6	TIME AS THE RFA IS CIRCULATED.
7	IT HIGHLIGHTED A REAL NEED IN THAT AREA IN
8	MANY DIFFERENT RESPECTS, WHICH SEAN HAS ALLUDED TO,
9	AND DROVE HOME THE POINT ABOUT HOW THE COMMUNITY
10	CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE ARE GOING TO BE A VERY
11	MATERIAL ADD IN TERMS OF ACCESSIBILITY TO OUR ALPHA
12	CLINICS NETWORK, WHICH, AS YOU RECALL, WE RECENTLY
13	EXPANDED TO NINE FACILITIES. AND SO THIS AS A FIRST
14	MEETING WAS TERRIFIC IN MY OPINION.
15	ADRIANA, WOULD YOU LIKE TO ARE YOU ON?
16	IS ADRIANA ON?
17	DR. PADILLA: YES. THANK YOU.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE CAN HEAR YOU. THANK
19	YOU.
20	DR. PADILLA: OKAY. GREAT. I JUST WANT
21	TO SAY THANK YOU. IT WAS A REALLY NICE
22	GET-TOGETHER. AND THANK YOU, SEAN, TO PUT THIS ON
23	AND TO DO AN EXCELLENT SUMMARY FOR US.
24	I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT IT WAS REALLY
25	NICE TO SEE THE UC DAVIS ALPHA CENTER THERE. VERY
	98

1	HELPFUL TO REACH OUT. AND I THINK THAT IF OTHER
2	ALPHA CENTERS THAT ARE CLOSE TO US CAN REACH OUT AND
3	WORK IN A COLLABORATIVE WAY, IT'S GOING TO TAKE OFF
4	THAT MUCH FASTER.
5	DR. TURBEVILLE: OKAY. VERY GOOD. ANY
6	OTHER COMMENTS?
7	DR. BARRETT: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A VERY
8	MINOR COMMENT. THE FIRST ONE IS NOT MINOR. I
9	REALLY APPLAUD THIS EFFORT. I'M VERY GLAD, OF
10	COURSE, THAT UC DAVIS WAS REPRESENTED.
11	MY VERY MINOR COMMENT, SEAN, FOR FURTHER
12	DISSEMINATION OF THESE VERY IMPORTANT TAKEAWAYS IS
13	TO CORRECT THE SPELLING OF PEER TO PEER. I THINK
14	YOU MEAN P-E-E-R HERE, NOT P-I-E-R.
15	DR. TURBEVILLE: OKAY. THANK YOU. GOOD
16	CATCH. OKAY. VERY GOOD.
17	WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, IF IT'S OKAY, I'D LIKE
18	TO MOVE OVER TO ANOTHER UPDATE.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY.
20	DR. TURBEVILLE: GOOD. SO ANOTHER
21	FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN IS TO COORDINATE WITH THE
22	AAWG IN DEVELOPING A ROAD MAP FOR ACCESS AND
23	AFFORDABILITY OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE FOR ALL
24	CALIFORNIA PATIENTS. SO THIS ROAD MAP WILL INCLUDE
25	A STRATEGY FOR GATHERING THE NECESSARY DATA TO
	99
	J.J.

1	SUPPORT REIMBURSEMENT, TO ENGAGE WITH POLICYMAKERS
2	AND REGULATORS, AND DEVELOP HEALTHCARE DELIVERY
3	MODELS THAT CAN BE IMPLEMENTED AND REFINED WITH THE
4	ALPHA CLINICS AND FUTURE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF
5	EXCELLENCE.
6	SO IN JANUARY OF 2023, WE WILL KICK OFF
7	THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOCUSING ON WELL, KICK OFF ONE
8	OF OUR ROAD MAPS FOR AFFORDABILITY AND
9	ACCESSIBILITY. WE WILL BE FOCUSING FOR THE MOST
10	PART ON CIRM-FUNDED CLINICAL TRIALS AND POTENTIALLY
11	APPROVED THERAPIES. SO THIS SLIDE IS JUST AN
12	EXAMPLE THAT WE PRESENTED TO THE AAWG ABOUT A WEEK
13	AGO OF THE STRATEGIES WE RECENTLY BROUGHT FOR INPUT,
14	RECOMMENDATION, AND CONSIDERATION. THIS IS BY NO
15	MEANS VETTED. IT'S JUST AN EXAMPLE OF SOME OF THE
16	STRATEGIES THAT WE WANT TO CONSIDER GOING AFTER.
17	THESE STRATEGIES ARE ALIGNED WITH THE LANGUAGE OF
18	PROPOSITION 14.
19	SO SOME OF THE STRATEGIES WE WOULD LIKE TO
20	CONSIDER INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING: ONE, FACILITATE
21	REIMBURSEMENT AND LIMIT PATIENT EXPENSES. SO THERE
22	IS A LOT OF ACTIVITY RIGHT NOW WITH RESPECT TO OUT
23	OF PATIENT COST WHEN IT COMES TO NOT ONLY COMMERCIAL
24	AS WELL AS CLINICAL TRIALS. THIS SECTION, AND I'M
25	NOT GOING TO GO OVER EACH ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES
	100

100

-	
1	WITH RESPECT TO THE TACTICS, BUT THIS IS WHERE OUR
2	PATIENT SUPPORT SERVICES SIT. AND WE ARE LOOKING
3	FORWARD TO LAUNCHING THAT PROGRAM, BRINGING DATA TO
4	THE AAWG TO SHOW THE IMPACT THAT WE ARE HAVING FOR
5	PATIENTS, NOT ONLY ON THE FINANCIAL SIDE, BUT THE
6	ABILITY TO ACCESS TRIALS AS WELL.
7	THE OTHER STRATEGY THAT WE ARE CONSIDERING
8	IS THE SUPPORT FOR NEW PAYER MODELS. SO, ONE, THERE
9	IS A LOT OF ACTIVITY RIGHT NOW WITH VALUE-BASED
10	PAYMENT. SOME OF YOU ARE PROBABLY INVOLVED WITH
11	THAT. WE'VE ALREADY RECEIVED QUITE A BIT OF INPUT
12	FROM OUR AAWG COLLEAGUES WHO HAVE GOTTEN US IN
13	CONTACT WITH SUBJECT MATTER THOUGHT LEADERS, IF YOU
14	WILL, ON WHAT THESE PROGRAMS LOOK LIKE. THERE'S AN
15	OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO ENGAGE. WE JUST RECENTLY
16	FOUND OUT ON THE PRIVATE SIDE WITH PRIVATE PAYERS
17	THERE ARE CONCATENATING, IF YOU WILL, RISK POOLS AND
18	COALITION PARTNERS. SO THERE ARE QUITE A FEW
19	STRATEGIES THAT WE CAN LOOK AT THAT WOULD ALLOW US
20	TO SUPPORT SOME OF THE NEW PAYER MODELS FOR CELL AND
21	GENE THERAPIES.
22	ANOTHER STRATEGY THAT WE MAY WANT TO
23	CONSIDER IS THE STATE POLICY ISSUE. AND DO WE WANT
24	TO CONSIDER CREATING AND/OR ENDORSING NEW STATE
25	POLICY FOR CELL AND GENE THERAPIES AT THE STATE
	101

1	LEVEL? WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY ALSO AT THE FEDERAL
2	LEVEL. SENATOR TORRES ALREADY GOT US IN CONTACT
3	WITH THE GOVERNOR'S PLAN AND SOME OF THE COLLEAGUES
4	OVER THERE ON THE OFFICE OF HEALTH AND
5	AFFORDABILITY. SO THERE'S A GOOD OPPORTUNITY FOR US
6	TO HAVE SOME SYNERGIES WITH THE STATE.
7	AND THEN, FINALLY, ANOTHER STRATEGY IS TO
8	EXPAND THE CLINICAL INFRASTRUCTURE. AND THIS IS
9	REALLY JUST TO PIGGYBACK ON ALL THE GREAT WORK CIRM
10	HAS ALREADY DONE WITH THE ALPHA CLINICS. THOSE HAVE
11	EXPANDED. WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH,
12	LET'S SAY, POSTMARKETING REGISTRIES, WHICH IS A BIG
13	DEMAND WITH RESPECT TO THOSE VALUE-BASED PAYMENTS
14	FOR CELL AND GENE THERAPY. THOSE ARE CRITICAL. WE
15	HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE
16	WITH THE ALPHA CLINICS AND THE REPOSITORY OF DATA
17	THAT'S OUT THERE. THAT CONCLUDES H-E-O-R AS WELL.
18	ANOTHER COMPONENT, OF COURSE, IS
19	ACCELERATE ADVOCACY AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL AND THE
20	MEDICAL EDUCATION.
21	SO THE GOAL MOVING FORWARD HERE IS THE
22	NEXT SIX MONTHS, EVERY MONTH WE WILL BE PRESENTING
23	DATA FOR EACH ONE OF THESE STRATEGIES TO THE AAWG.
24	WE WILL GO BACK AND DO OUR DILIGENCE ON THE
25	RESEARCH, WE'LL BRING IN OUR SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS,
	102

1	THEN PRESENT THAT TO THE AAWG. CUMULATIVELY OVER
2	SIX MONTHS, WE ARE HOPING THAT WE WILL HAVE AN
3	APPROVED ROAD MAP FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY
4	THROUGH THOSE PROCESSES AND THEN PRESENT THAT TO THE
5	ICOC FOR FINAL APPROVAL AND PERHAPS EXECUTION OF
6	SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS.
7	SO WITH THAT, AGAIN, THIS IS JUST KICKING
8	OFF IN JANUARY. WE HAVE A FULL SCHEDULE UP UNTIL
9	JUNE/JULY. WE HAVE HAD A PRODUCTIVE NINE MONTHS
10	FROM THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS SIDE, AND WE ARE LOOKING
11	FORWARD TO CONTINUING THE MOMENTUM IN 2023. SO WITH
12	THAT, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL GO AHEAD AND PUNT IT BACK
13	OVER TO YOU. AND THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY FOR
14	THE UPDATE.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
16	SEAN. ARE THERE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS OF SEAN ON
17	THIS PARTICULAR SLIDE?
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED HAS HIS HAND RAISED.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FRED.
20	DR. FISHER: JUST QUICKLY. THANK YOU,
21	SEAN, FOR THIS. SPEAKING AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE FOR
22	ALS AND MS, I'LL JUST GO ON RECORD THAT THESE
23	VALUE-BASED INITIATIVES ARE A NIGHTMARE FOR THE ALS,
24	MS, AND OTHER NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE COMMUNITIES.
25	PROBABLY SPINAL CORD INJURY FITS IN THERE AS WELL.
	103

103

1	SO I WOULD ENCOURAGE US TO LOOK VERY CAREFULLY AND
2	GET LOTS OF FEEDBACK FROM STAKEHOLDERS AND VARIOUS
3	GROUPS, PATIENT GROUPS, ABOUT THE POTENTIAL IMPACT
4	OF VALUE-BASED MODELS FOR COVERAGE.
5	THE OTHER THING THAT I DIDN'T HEAR YOU
6	MENTION EXPLICITLY, BUT WILL JUST PUT ON THE TABLE
7	IS HOPEFULLY AT SOME POINT IN YOUR PROCESS YOU WILL
8	ENGAGE THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF MANAGED CARE,
9	WHICH I THINK COVERS ABOUT 90 PERCENT OF INSURERS IN
10	THE STATE AS WELL AS THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
11	INSURANCE, WHICH DEALS WITH THE OTHER TEN, BECAUSE
12	WHEN IT COMES TO COVERAGE FOR CARE, EVEN FOR PEOPLE
13	WHO ARE WELL INSURED, THE THERAPIES FOR
14	NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE, THE ONES THAT HAVE BEEN
15	APPROVED RECENTLY ARE EXCEEDINGLY EXPENSIVE, AND
16	INSURANCE COMPANIES' FIRST RESPONSE IS TO LOOK FOR A
17	WAY TO DENY COVERAGE EVEN TO THOSE WHO HAVE
18	INSURANCE, LET ALONE THOSE WHO DON'T. SO I'LL LEAVE
19	IT AT THAT. I KNOW YOU HAVE A LOT MORE WORK TO DO,
20	BUT I FIGURED I'D JUST PUT THAT OUT FOR NOW.
21	THANKS.
22	DR. TURBEVILLE: THANK YOU. GOOD
23	COMMENTS.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR
25	COMMENTS OF SEAN?
	104
ļ	

1	DR. LEVITT: I WAS JUST GOING TO J.T.,
2	IT'S PAT. AT THE MEETING WE TALKED ABOUT AT THE
3	SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING WE TALKED ABOUT THE ISSUES THAT
4	FRED RAISED. AND IT APPLIES BROADLY TO CHALLENGES
5	IN TERMS OF REIMBURSEMENT SITUATIONS IN PEDIATRICS
6	IN GENERAL IN CALIFORNIA. WE ARE AMONG THE WORST
7	STATES. AND WITH SCHEDULES THAT IN SOME CASES
8	HAVEN'T BEEN UPDATED FOR 10, 12 YEARS. SO THIS
9	ISSUE AROUND ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY IS
10	GOING TO BE A REAL ONE. WE ALREADY KNOW THERE'S
11	LOTS OF DATA THAT INDICATES THAT IF YOU'RE ON
12	MEDI-CAL AS A PEDIATRIC PATIENT, YOUR WAIT TIME IS
13	SIGNIFICANTLY LONGER THAN IF YOU HAVE PRIVATE
14	INSURANCE, WAIT TIME TO JUST GET IN TO SEE A
15	PHYSICIAN. AND THAT WILL TRANSLATE IN TERMS OF WHAT
16	WE ARE TRYING TO DO HERE.
17	SO SEAN AND I HAVE CONVERSED OFF LINE AS
18	WELL, AND HE'S WELL AWARE OF THIS AND I THINK IS
19	DOING A SUPERB JOB IN LEADING THIS EFFORT, THIS VERY
20	IMPORTANT EFFORT.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, PAT. OTHER
22	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
23	MR. TORRES: JUST WANTED TO AGREE WITH
24	THAT.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ART.
	105

DR. LEVITT: HALLELUJAH. 1 2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER QUESTIONS OR 3 COMMENTS? MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS HAS HIS 4 5 HAND RAISED. CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DAVID. 6 DR. HIGGINS: YEAH. THE RECENT 7 PROPOSITION THAT PASSED THAT RE-FUNDED US FOR 8 9 ANOTHER FIVE POINT SOMETHING BILLION DOLLARS INCLUDED, I BELIEVE, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, J.T., 10 BUT A COMMITMENT TO SPEND ONE AND A HALF BILLION OF 11 THAT ON NEUROSCIENCE, NOT NECESSARILY 12 13 NEURODEGENERATIVE, BUT NEUROSCIENCE BASED -- NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES. DOES THIS EFFORT 14 THAT WE ARE HEARING ABOUT HERE TODAY REFLECT THAT 15 SORT OF LOPSIDED, IF YOU WILL, I DON'T MEAN 16 17 TO -- I'M OBVIOUSLY NOT TRYING TO DISPARAGE NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES. BUT IS THERE ANY REFLECTION 18 19 IN YOUR EFFORT AS TO WHAT THE PROPOSITION'S SORT OF 20 UNBALANCED EFFORT TOWARDS NEUROLOGY WAS? DO YOU GO OUT AND LOOK SPECIFICALLY FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES 21 22 TO BRING INTO THIS PROGRAM MIGHT BE ONE QUESTION. DR. TURBEVILLE: YEAH. THERE'S CERTAINLY 23 AN INITIATIVE AND WE HAD A DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT 24 25 YESTERDAY. SOME OF THOSE ARE EARLY STAGE ASSETS.

1	AND SO WHEN WE ARE STARTING TO THINK ABOUT ACCESS
2	AND AFFORDABILITY, ONCE THOSE START GOING THROUGH
3	THAT PIPELINE AND GET TO THE CLINIC, THEN I THINK,
4	YEAH, THERE COULD BE A COMPONENT HERE WHERE WE COULD
5	START ASSESSING SOME OF THAT. AND THAT'S TRUE ALL
6	THE WAY THROUGH THAT LIFE CYCLE MANAGEMENT TO
7	COMMERCIALIZATION. BUT FOR SPECIFICALLY RIGHT NOW,
8	THESE ARE MOSTLY CLINICAL TRIALS AS WELL AS
9	COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS.

MR. TORRES: ON THAT POINT, WHEN BOB KLEIN 10 AND I WROTE THIS LANGUAGE, THERE WAS MUCH INTERNAL 11 DEBATE AMONG THE SUPPORTERS AND ACTIVISTS THAT SOME 12 SCIENTISTS SAID, NO, DON'T CREATE A SEPARATE ENTITY. 13 OTHERS SAYING YOU'RE NOT PAYING ENOUGH ATTENTION TO 14 15 NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES. YOU OUGHT TO HAVE A SEPARATE -- AT LEAST A SEPARATE AMOUNT THAT YOU 16 CONCENTRATE ON. AND THAT'S WHERE WE ENDED UP. 17 NOW IT'S UP TO CIRM TO DEVELOP A STRATEGY, WHICH IT IS 18 19 IN THE PROCESS OF DOING. I THINK, DAVID, YOU'RE GOING TO BE PART OF THOSE DISCUSSIONS AS ARE THE 20 21 OTHER ADVOCATES FROM ALS, MS, NEURODEGENERATIVE 22 DISEASES TO MAKE SURE THAT THE NEXT STEPS THAT WE TAKE STARTING IN JANUARY, FEBRUARY ARE LEADING 23 TOWARD A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE UTILIZATION OF THE 24 25 1.5 BILLION.

107

1	DR. HIGGINS: THANK YOU.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR
3	QUESTIONS FOR SEAN?
4	MR. TORRES: THANK YOU AGAIN, SEAN.
5	DR. TURBEVILLE: WELCOME. THANK YOU FOR
6	THE OPPORTUNITY.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THE LAST
8	ITEM THIS IS THIS NEW SECTION WE'VE ADDED TO THE
9	EXTENT THERE ANY GENERAL COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
10	THE BOARD ABOUT THE APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS.
11	THIS IS LOOKING FOR ANY BOARD COMMENT, ANY MEMBERS.
12	THIS IS SORT OF A PLACEHOLDER ITEM HERE. AT ANY
13	SUCH TIME IN FUTURE MEETINGS WHERE THERE ARE
14	COMMENTS, YOU'LL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY.
15	SO WE ARE NOW AT PUBLIC COMMENT. ANY
16	MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WISH TO MAKE ANY COMMENT ABOUT
17	ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR?
18	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: I DON'T SEE ANY,
19	Ј.Т.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU,
21	MARIANNE.
22	WELL, THAT CONCLUDES TODAY'S MEETING. I
23	WOULD LIKE TO ADJOURN IN KEVIN MEMORY. AND ALTHOUGH
24	THIS IS, TO GO FULL CIRCLE TO THE BEGINNING OF THE
25	MEETING, A VERY SAD TIME, I KNOW THAT KEVIN, WERE HE
	108

1	HERE, WOULD SAY TO ALL OF YOU LOVELY PEOPLE HAVE A
2	HAPPY HOLIDAY SEASON.
3	MR. TORRES: HERE. HERE.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AND A HEALTHY,
5	PROSPEROUS NEW YEAR.
6	MR. TORRES: THANK YOU.
7	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: AND EVERYONE
8	REMEMBER THE JANUARY 26TH IN-PERSON BOARD MEETING
9	HERE IN SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
11	THANK YOU, EVERYBODY. HAPPY HOLIDAYS. WE STAND
12	ADJOURNED.
13	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	109

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON DECEMBER 15, 2022, 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

110