#### BEFORE THE

INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT

#### **EMERGENCY MEETING**

LOCATION: MEETING CONDUCTED VIA ZOOM

APRIL 10, 2020 DATE:

11 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2020-07

#### INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION:	
CALL TO ORDER.	3
ROLL CALL.	3
ACTION ITEMS:	
4. CONSIDERATION OF EXISTENCE OF EMERGENCY SITUATION. "EMERGENCY SITUATION" MEANS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING, AS DETERMINED BY A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE: (A) WORK STOPPAGE OR OTHER A CTIVITY THAT SEVERELY IMPAIRS PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY, OR BOTH.	8
(B) CRIPPLING DISASTER THAT SEVERELY IMPAIRS PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY, OR BOTH.	
5. CONSIDERATION OF MODIFICATIONS TO COVID-19 PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT TO EXPAND ELIGIBILITY AND MAKE OTHER CHANGES.	11
6. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT OF SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	50
DISCUSSION ITEMS:	
PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE
ADJOURNMENT.	53

	,
1	APRIL 10, 2020; 11 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WELL, THANK YOU,
4	EVERYBODY. I'D LIKE TO WELCOME ALL TO THE FIRST
5	OFFICIAL ZOOM MEETING OF THE ICOC AND APPLICATION
6	REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR
7	BEING AVAILABLE FOR THIS SECOND EMERGENCY SESSION
8	AND EXTREMELY SHORT NOTICE, AND SHOUT OUT GOES TO
9	MARIA BONNEVILLE FOR PULLING THIS ALTOGETHER IN
10	WORLD RECORD TIME.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: IT WAS A BIG GROUP
12	EFFORT. SO THANK YOU TO DOUG AND TRICIA AS WELL.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE
14	CALL THE ROLL.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
16	DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
18	DR. BOXER: PRESENT.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEN BURTIS.
20	DR. BURTIS: HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE
22	DULIEGE.
23	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
25	MS. DURON: HERE.
	3
	3

1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: SORRY THE VIDEO IS
2	NOT WORKING, BUT THEY'LL BE ABLE TO HEAR YOU.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.
4	DR. FINE: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON. JUDY, I
6	KNOW YOU'RE ON. I THINK YOU'RE ON MUTE. WE'LL COME
7	BACK TO JUDY.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
9	MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS. LINDA, I
11	THINK YOU ALSO ARE ON. ARE YOU ON MUTE? HOLD ON.
12	LET ME GO BACK TO JUDY. JUDY IS NOT ON MUTE, BUT
13	CANNOT TALK FOR SOME REASON. I DON'T KNOW WHY.
14	AND, LINDA, YOU'RE ALSO NOT ON MUTE. I SEE YOU ON
15	THERE. SO LET ME COME BACK TO YOU GUYS.
16	DAVE MARTIN. DAVE, YOU'RE ON MUTE. I CAN
17	SEE THAT YOU'RE ON MUTE. NO, YOU'RE STILL ON MUTE.
18	LAUREN MILLER. ADRIANA PADILLA.
19	DR. MARTIN: ALL RIGHT. DAVE'S HERE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA, I ALSO SEE YOUR
21	NAME, BUT YOU'RE ON MUTE. NO, YOU'RE NOT ON MUTE,
22	BUT YOU'RE NOT ABLE TO SPEAK.
23	DR. MARTIN: THERE'S A LITTLE MUTE TAG AT
24	THE VERY UP RIGHT-HAND CORNER ON THE SCREEN. MY
25	PHONE WASN'T MUTED, BUT YOU HAVE TO UNMUTE THAT.

	DETTI G. DIATIN, CA CSR NO. 7 132
1	THAT'S WHAT I JUST DISCOVERED.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
3	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO. ROBERT
5	QUINT.
6	DR. QUINT: HERE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT. SUZANNE
8	SANDMEYER.
9	DR. SANDMEYER: HERE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY. OSWALD
11	STEWARD. JONATHAN THOMAS.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
14	MR. TORRES: HERE. I CHOSE MY BACKGROUND
15	FOR MR. BLUMENTHAL.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
17	DR. VUORI: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. KEITH
19	YAMAMOTO AND DOUG ZIEDONIS.
20	DR. ZIEDONIS: I'M HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. J.T, CAN YOU
22	HOLD ON FOR A SECOND BECAUSE I KNOW WE'VE GOT SOME
23	PEOPLE THAT JUST ARE NOT ABLE TO DIAL IN. WAS THAT
24	KEITH THAT SAID HE WAS HERE OR WAS THAT DOUG?
25	DR. ZIEDONIS: DOUG ZIEDONIS.
	r
	5

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: OKAY. THANK YOU. HOLD
2	ON FOR ONE SECOND. JUST GIVE US TWO MINUTES. WE'RE
3	UNMUTING EVERYONE ON OUR END TO SEE IF THAT HELPS
4	WITH A FEW OF THE PEOPLE.
5	DR. MARTIN: WE CAN HEAR YOU NOW.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE CAN SEE LINDA, BUT I
7	CAN'T HEAR HER.
8	DR. MALKAS: YOU CAN SEE ME?
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: OH, I CAN SEE YOU AND I
10	CAN HEAR YOU NOW. AWESOME. THERE YOU ARE.
11	JUDY GASSON. STILL NOT YET. HOW ABOUT
12	ADRIANA PADILLA?
13	MR. TORRES: SHE JUST E-MAILED A CHAT
14	REQUESTING TO PHONE IN.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: CAN I CHOOSE PHONE
16	CHECK-IN? HOLD ON FOR ONE SECOND. LET ME SEE ABOUT
17	THAT. LET ME GET BACK TO ADRIANA. HOW ABOUT
18	FRANCISCO PRIETO?
19	DR. GASSON: MARIA, THIS IS JUDY. I'M
20	HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: OH, JUDY. THANK YOU. WE
22	CAN HEAR YOU. THANK YOU.
23	HOW ABOUT AL ROWLETT?
24	DR. YAMAMOTO: MARIA, THIS IS KEITH
25	YAMAMOTO. I'M HERE.
	6

i	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: DOUG, CAN YOU CHECK ON
2	ADRIANA AND FRANCISCO, AL, AND OS? FRANCISCO, CAN
3	YOU HEAR US AND CAN WE HEAR YOU, I HOPE?
4	DR. PRIETO: YES, I CAN HEAR YOU NOW. YOU
5	CAN HEAR ME?
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES, WE CAN. HOW ABOUT
7	AL ROWLETT? JEFF SHEEHY, ARE YOU ON?
8	MR. SHEEHY: YES, I AM.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: EXCELLENT. THANK YOU.
10	HOW ABOUT OS? HE SAYS HE'S ON THE PHONE, BUT WE
11	CAN'T HEAR OS. AL IS CALLING BACK IN. STAR SIX.
12	MR. ROWLETT: MARIA, CAN YOU HEAR ME?
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. IT'S GREAT TO HEAR
14	YOU, AL.
15	DR. PADILLA: THIS IS ADRIANA. CAN YOU
16	HEAR ME?
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE CAN. THANK YOU,
18	ADRIANA. I THINK THE ONLY ONE WE'RE MISSING NOW IS
19	OS AND DIANE.
20	DR. STEWARD: I'M HERE.
21	MS. WINOKUR: I'M HERE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: OH, WE'VE GOT YOU GUYS.
23	THAT'S GREAT.
24	OKAY. SO WE'VE GOT ROLL TAKEN CARE OF
25	NOW.
	7
	,

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, WOULD YOU LIKE TO
2	SAY A COUPLE WORDS ABOUT PROCEDURE HERE USING ZOOM
3	WITH QUESTIONS THAT PARTICIPANTS FROM THE BOARD AND
4	THE PUBLIC MAY HAVE?
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK WE CAN DO WHAT WE
6	DID LAST TIME, WHICH IS IF YOU HAVE A QUESTION AFTER
7	THE PRESENTATION, JUST LET US KNOW. I'LL WRITE IT
8	DOWN IN ORDER, AND THEN WE CAN CALL ON BOARD MEMBERS
9	AS THEY LET ME KNOW.
10	AND THEN FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, IT
11	WOULD BE THE SAME. IT WOULD BE A THREE-MINUTE LIMIT
12	ON COMMENTS, AND WE CAN DO THE SAME. WE CAN GO
13	THROUGH THE LIST AS PEOPLE RAISE THEIR HANDS OR ASK
14	TO BE CALLED ON. WE CAN THEN TAKE THEM THAT WAY AS
15	WELL.
16	AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REMIND MEMBERS OF
17	THE PUBLIC TO LIMIT PUBLIC COMMENT TO THE AGENDA
18	TOPIC AT HAND. AND THEN IF YOU HAVE GENERAL PUBLIC
19	COMMENT, THAT CAN BE TAKEN AT THE END OF THE
20	MEETING.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY
22	MUCH, MARIA. AND, AGAIN, THANK YOU TO ALL MEMBERS
23	OF THE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC FOR PARTICIPATING TODAY.
24	VERY MUCH HOPE EVERYBODY IS SAFE AND HEALTHY IN
25	THESE MOST UNSETTLING TIMES.

	,
1	WE'RE GOING TO PROCEED NOW TO THE ACTION
2	ITEMS. NO. 4 AGENDA TOPIC IS CONSIDERATION OF
3	EXISTENCE OF EMERGENCY SITUATION. EMERGENCY
4	SITUATION MEANS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AS DETERMINED
5	BY A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC: A) WORK
6	STOPPAGE OR OTHER ACTIVITY THAT SEVERELY IMPAIRS
7	PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY OR BOTH; OR, B) CRIPPLING
8	DISASTER THAT SEVERELY IMPAIRS PUBLIC HEALTH OR
9	SAFETY OR BOTH.
10	OPEN IT UP FOR A MOTION TO BEGIN WITH.
11	DR. BLUMENTHAL: SO MOVED.
12	DR. BURTIS: SECOND.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: WHO MOVED AND SECONDED,
14	PLEASE?
15	DR. BLUMENTHAL: BLUMENTHAL MOVED.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.
17	DR. BURTIS: KEN BURTIS SECONDED.
18	DR. YAMAMOTO: KEITH YAMAMOTO SECOND.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: OKAY. THANK YOU.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, EVERYBODY.
21	OPEN IT UP FOR DISCUSSION. AND KEEP IN MIND THIS IS
22	NOT A DISCUSSION ON THE SUBSTANCE OF THE VRO ISSUE.
23	THIS IS A DISCUSSION ON WHETHER OR NOT THIS
24	CONSTITUTES AN EMERGENCY SITUATION AS PROVIDED BY
25	PROP 71.
	a

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1	ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
2	BOARD? HEARING NONE, ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM
3	MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? HEARING NONE, WE'LL PROCEED
4	STRAIGHT TO A ROLL CALL VOTE. JAMES, WILL YOU CALL
5	THE ROLL MARIA.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: I SURE WILL.
7	GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
8	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
10	DR. BOXER: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEN BURTIS.
12	DR. BURTIS: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
14	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
16	MS. DURON: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.
18	DR. FINE: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
20	DR. GASSON: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
22	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
24	DR. MALKAS: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. ADRIANA
	10
	10

	1	
1	PADILLA.	
2		DR. PADILLA: YES.
3		MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
4		MR. PANETTA: YES.
5		MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
6		DR. PRIETO: AYE.
7		MS. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
8		DR. QUINT: YES.
9		MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
10		MR. ROWLETT: YES.
11		MS. BONNEVILLE: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
12		DR. SANDMEYER: YES.
13		MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
14		MR. SHEEHY: YES.
15		MS. BONNEVILLE: OSWALD STEWARD.
16		DR. STEWARD: YES.
17		MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
18		CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
19		MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
20		MR. TORRES: AYE.
21		MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
22		DR. VUORI: YES.
23		MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
24		MS. WINOKUR: YES.
25		MS. BONNEVILLE: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
		11
		TT.

1	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: DOUG ZIEDONIS.
3	DR. MARTIN: AND DAVE MARTIN YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. THANK YOU.
5	MOTION CARRIES.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
7	SO, AS YOU ALL ARE AWARE, PROP 71, IN
8	ADDITION TO THE PROJECTS THAT WE NORMALLY HAVE
9	FUNDED OVER THE YEARS, HAS ALWAYS ALLOWED FOR
10	CONSIDERATION OF SOMETHING CALLED VITAL RESEARCH
11	OPPORTUNITIES, WHICH ARE PROJECTS THAT ARE NOT IN
12	SCOPE DIRECTLY, BUT ARE DEEMED BY THE BOARD AND THE
13	GWG TO BE OF SUCH IMPORT AND RELATION TO WHAT WE DO
14	THAT WE WOULD CONSIDER THEM FOR FUNDING AS WELL.
15	THE PROCESS THAT WE'VE UNDERTAKEN IN
16	SIMILAR CIRCUMSTANCES BEFORE, IF WE HAVE VITAL
17	RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, WHICH I SHALL REFER TO AS
18	VRO'S FROM HERE ON OUT, PROCESS WAS TYPIFIED BY AN
19	AGENDA ITEM AT OUR NOVEMBER 2018 BOARD MEETING WHERE
20	WE CONSIDERED THE QUESTION OF WOULD GENE THERAPY AS
21	A CATEGORY QUALIFY FROM AN ELIGIBILITY STANDPOINT
22	FOR SOMETHING THAT THE GWG SHOULD EVALUATE IN ITS
23	NORMAL COURSE. WE HAD A DISCUSSION ON THAT TOPIC.
24	THE BOARD AT THAT MEETING DETERMINED THAT GENE
25	THERAPY WOULD QUALIFY AS A VRO. WE THEN HAD

1	PROJECTS SUBMITTED THAT WENT TO THE GWG FOR
2	CONSIDERATION BOTH ON SCIENTIFIC MERIT AND ON THE
3	QUESTION OF DOES THIS QUALIFY FOR A VRO OR NOT.
4	PROJECTS THAT PROCEEDED THROUGH THAT
5	PROCEDURE, IF THEY WERE DEEMED TO BE A VRO, THEY
6	THEN WENT TO THE BOARD AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW
7	SUBCOMMITTEE FOR A FUNDING DECISION THAT THOSE
8	PROJECTS THAT AT THE GWG WERE NOT DEEMED TO BE A
9	VRO, THAT WAS THE END OF THE LINE AND THE PROJECTS
10	WERE WITHDRAWN AT THAT POINT AND DID NOT GO TO THE
11	BOARD OR APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE FOR ANY
12	FURTHER CONSIDERATION.
13	SO THAT'S THE PROCESS THAT WE HAVE HAD IN
14	THE PAST. IT'S THE PROCESS WE'RE GOING TO FOLLOW
15	HERE. YOU MAY RECALL AT OUR FIRST EMERGENCY SESSION
16	A COUPLE WEEKS AGO IN PUBLIC COMMENT THERE WAS
17	MENTION OF THE TOPIC OF CONVALESCENT PLASMA. WE
18	HAVE HAD A LOT OF DISCUSSION SINCE THAT BOARD
19	MEETING BOTH INTERNALLY AND INDEED NATIONALLY AND
20	INTERNATIONALLY ON THE TOPIC.
21	AND SO THE QUESTION HAS ARISEN, GIVEN THAT
22	CONVALESCENT PLASMA IS ONE OF THOSE PROJECT TYPES
23	THAT FALLS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF WHAT WE NORMALLY
24	FUND, WOULD THIS BE SOMETHING THAT SHOULD BE DEEMED
25	ELIGIBLE FOR REVIEW BY THE GWG AS A GENERAL TOPIC.

1	AND SO IT IS TO THAT END THAT WE CALLED THIS SECOND
2	EMERGENCY SESSION TO DISCUSS THAT MATTER; AND,
3	HENCE, WE HAVE ITEM 5 ON THE AGENDA, WHICH READS
4	SPECIFICALLY, "CONSIDERATION OF MODIFICATIONS TO
5	COVID-19 PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT TO EXPAND
6	ELIGIBILITY AND MAKE OTHER CHANGES."
7	SO WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO HERE IS WE'RE
8	GOING TO HAVE A PRESENTATION FROM DR. SAMBRANO ALL
9	AROUND THE QUESTION OF SHOULD CONVALESCENT PLASMA
10	CONSTITUTE A VRO FOR ELIGIBILITY PURPOSES FOR GWG
11	ANALYSIS. THERE ARE A COUPLE OF SUBQUESTIONS THAT
12	ATTEND TO THAT OVERALL QUESTION, WHICH DR. SAMBRANO
13	WILL BRING UP AS WELL IN HIS PRESENTATION.
14	SO WITHOUT FURTHER ADO HERE, WHY DON'T WE
15	TURN TO DR. SAMBRANO FOR THAT PRESENTATION. AND
16	AFTER THAT TIME, WE WILL HAVE FULL OPPORTUNITY FOR
17	THE BOARD AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO DISCUSS. DR.
18	SAMBRANO.
19	DR. SAMBRANO: GREAT. THANK YOU, DR.
20	THOMAS.
21	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, CIRM TEAM, AND THE
22	PUBLIC, REALLY GOOD TO SEE EVEN IF IT'S ONLY ON
23	VIDEO, BUT GOOD MORNING TO ALL OF YOU.
24	SO AS MENTIONED, TWO WEEKS AGO WE CAME
25	BEFORE YOU TO PRESENT A PROPOSED SOLICITATION FOR

1	COVID-19 PROJECTS. AND SO IF YOU COULD GO TO THE
2	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, DOUG. SO WE PROVIDED A PROPOSAL
3	FOR ISSUING THAT SOLICITATION. SO THAT HAS BEEN
4	DONE. WE'VE ACTUALLY EVEN HAD OUR FIRST APPLICATION
5	DEADLINE. AND SO WE ARE UTILIZING OUR PROGRAMS
6	ACROSS DISCOVERY AND CLINICAL IN ORDER TO FACILITATE
7	THE APPLICATION REVIEW AND FUNDING PROCESS.
8	ALSO AT THAT TIME THE BOARD APPROVED AN
9	ALLOCATION OF FIVE MILLION TO SUPPORT THIS PROGRAM.
10	NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.
11	AND AS WAS ALSO MENTIONED, WE WERE ASKED
12	TO CONSIDER CONVALESCENT PLASMA AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO
13	MAKE AN IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON COVID-19 AT THE LAST
14	BOARD MEETING. AND WE HAVE INDEED LOOKED INTO IT A
15	BIT, AND WE DO AGREE THAT THIS IS AN AREA OF
16	INVESTIGATION THAT DESERVES ATTENTION. SO IN LIGHT
17	OF THIS, THERE'S THREE AMENDMENTS THAT WE'D LIKE TO
18	DISCUSS WITH YOU THAT ARE OUTLINED ON THIS SLIDE,
19	WHICH INCLUDE INCREASING THE SCOPE TO INCLUDE
20	INVESTIGATIONAL STUDIES WITH CONVALESCENT PLASMA AND
21	ITS DERIVATIVES AS A POTENTIAL VITAL RESEARCH
22	OPPORTUNITY.
23	SECONDLY, TO ALLOW THE USE OF FDA
24	SINGLE-PATIENT EMERGENCY IND PATHWAY FOR CLINICAL
25	STUDIES WITH CONVALESCENT PLASMA.

1	AND, FINALLY, TO ALLOW FUNDED CLINICAL
2	PROJECTS TO START INCURRING ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS
3	FROM THE DATE OF THE APPLICATION SUBMISSION
4	DEADLINE. NEXT SLIDE.
5	SO LET ME FIRST GIVE YOU A LITTLE
6	BACKGROUND ON CONVALESCENT PLASMA AND WHY IT IS THAT
7	IT COULD OFFER A POTENTIAL VITAL RESEARCH
8	OPPORTUNITY.
9	SO, AS MANY OF YOU MAY KNOW, CONVALESCENT
10	PLASMA IS THE COMPONENT IN BLOOD THAT'S COLLECTED
11	FROM PATIENTS WHO HAVE RECOVERED FROM AN INFECTION,
12	IN THIS CASE FROM COVID-19, THAT CONTAINS ANTIBODIES
13	AGAINST THE VIRUS. SO THE USE OF CONVALESCENT
14	PLASMA IS AND REMAINS AN INVESTIGATIONAL TREATMENT
15	FOR PATIENTS. IT IS GENERALLY CONSIDERED SAFE, AND
16	IT HAS BEEN USED SINCE EVEN THE EMERGENCE OF THE
17	SPANISH FLU BACK IN THE 1918/1920, AND MORE RECENTLY
18	WITH H1N1, THE AVIAN FLU, AND SARS 1.
19	MOST RECENTLY THERE HAVE BEEN SOME
20	PUBLICATIONS THAT SHOW PROMISE IN THE CLINICAL
21	SETTING FOR COVID-19 PATIENTS. BUT DESPITE ALL
22	THIS, IT'S STILL NOT YET AN APPROVED PRODUCT UNDER
23	THE FDA. HOWEVER, THE FDA HAS ISSUED SOME SPECIAL
24	GUIDANCE RELATED TO THE USE OF CONVALESCENT PLASMA
25	TO TREAT COVID-19 GIVEN THAT THERE ARE NO OTHER

1	TREATMENTS AVAILABLE AND THAT THERE IS SOME
2	INDICATION OF PROMISE FOR ITS USE. AND SO THE FDA
3	IS PERMITTING EMERGENCY INVESTIGATIONAL USE UNDER
4	THE CRITERIA OF AN EMERGENCY IND IN ADDITION TO USE
5	OF A STANDARD IND PATHWAY.
6	SO CLEARLY MORE CLINICAL DATA THAT IS
7	COLLECTED FROM WELL-DESIGNED TRIALS AND STUDIES IS
8	NEEDED ULTIMATELY TO DETERMINE IF THIS APPROACH
9	COULD BE USED MORE BROADLY.
10	SO HOW IS IT THAT CIRM COULD MAKE AN
11	IMPACT AND HOW ARE WE UNIQUELY POSITIONED TO DO SO?
12	SO THERE'S THREE BASIC THINGS THAT WE THOUGHT WERE
13	IMPORTANT. SO, FIRST, WE WANT TO FUND PROJECTS THAT
14	USE CONVALESCENT PLASMA AS A TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS
15	IN NEED. THERE ARE OTHERS WHO ARE EXPLORING THE USE
16	OF CONVALESCENT PLASMA AS A PROPHYLAXIS THAT WOULD
17	BE IN GENERALLY HEALTHY INDIVIDUALS, FIRST
18	RESPONDERS, AND SO ON; BUT WE ARE LOOKING TO MAKE AN
19	IMPACT ON PATIENTS WHO ARE SICK, WHO HAVE COVID-19,
20	AND WHERE WE COULD HAVE AN IMPACT ON PEOPLE'S LIVES.
21	SO WE WANT TO FOCUS ON THAT.
22	CIRM WOULD ALSO SUPPORT FORMAL STUDIES
23	THAT COLLECT CLINICAL DATA FOR ANALYSIS AND TO
24	BETTER ASSESS THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL VALUE OF
25	THE THERAPEUTIC APPROACH. THIS IS IN ORDER TO

1	REALLY INFORM WHETHER THIS IS AN APPROACH THAT CAN
2	BE USED MORE BROADLY.
3	WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT CIRM CAN LEVERAGE THE
4	INFRASTRUCTURE IN CALIFORNIA, SUCH AS ESTABLISHED
5	CLINICAL NETWORKS, TO REACH MORE PATIENTS AND
6	FACILITATE THE PLASMA COLLECTION. AND, OF COURSE,
7	IF THIS IS SOMETHING THAT HAS AND SHOWS EVIDENCE OF
8	WORKING, WE'D OBVIOUSLY BE CONTRIBUTING TO MAKING AN
9	IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON THIS DISEASE.
10	SO THE NEXT SLIDE, PLEASE. SO I'LL GO
11	OVER THE THREE REQUESTS FOR THE BOARD. THE FIRST
12	ONE IS TO DETERMINE IF CONVALESCENT PLASMA AND ITS
13	DERIVATIVES, SUCH AS IMMUNOGLOBULIN CONTAINED WITHIN
14	THE PLASMA, FOR THE TREATMENT OF COVID-19 SHOULD BE
15	ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING UNDER CIRM. AND SO NORMALLY
16	THIS IS A BIOLOGIC THAT'S NOT ELIGIBLE FOR ENTRY
17	BECAUSE, AS MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY, THIS DOES NOT
18	CONTAIN STEM CELLS, IT IS NOT A STEM-CELL BASED
19	PRODUCT. BUT UNDER PROP 71 WE'RE PERMITTED TO FUND
20	PROJECTS THAT ARE NOT STEM-CELL RELATED IF THEY ARE
21	DEEMED A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY BY THE BOARD AND
22	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
23	AND THE DEFINITION OF VITAL RESEARCH
24	OPPORTUNITY AS FOUND IN PROP 71 IS QUOTED THERE. SO
25	IF THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT CONVALESCENT PLASMA

1	PROJECTS ARE A POTENTIAL VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY,
2	THEN WE WOULD AMEND THE COVID-19 PROGRAM
3	ANNOUNCEMENT TO INCLUDE CONVALESCENT PLASMA AND ITS
4	DERIVATIVES AS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING. THESE WOULD
5	UNDERGO GWG REVIEW BASED ON THE VITAL RESEARCH
6	OPPORTUNITY PROCESS USED FOR GENE THERAPY
7	APPLICATIONS WHERE THE GWG WOULD VOTE WHETHER OR NOT
8	THEY BELIEVE IT'S A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. AND
9	THEN IF IT IS, WE WOULD BRING THAT TO YOU FOR
10	APPROVAL.
11	SO THE NEXT ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION IS OR
12	FOR AMENDMENT IS CLINICAL STUDIES OF CONVALESCENT
13	PLASMA. SO THOSE THAT PROPOSE TO USE CONVALESCENT
14	PLASMA MAY PROPOSE USE OF FDA'S SINGLE-PATIENT
15	EMERGENCY IND PATHWAY IN ORDER TO SATISFY THE CLIN2
16	ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR A TRADITIONAL IND.
17	SO WHAT THIS WOULD ALLOW IS REACHING MORE
18	PATIENTS. AND GIVEN THAT CONVALESCENT PLASMA IS
19	SOMETHING THAT IS DETERMINED FOR PATIENT TREATMENT
20	ON A REAL-TIME BASIS, WE FELT THAT FOLLOWING ALONG
21	WITH THE FDA'S GUIDANCE AND ADVICE TO INCLUDE THOSE
22	EMERGENCY IND PATHWAYS SHOULD ALSO BE PART OF THE
23	CLINICAL STUDIES THAT WE SUPPORT.
24	SO, LASTLY, WE SUGGEST THAT ALL FUNDED
25	CLINICAL PROGRAMS, SO THIS WOULD BE THOSE THAT

1	INCLUDE CONVALESCENT PLASMA, BUT BASICALLY ANYTHING
2	THAT COMES IN THROUGH THE CLIN1 OR CLIN2, THAT THEY
3	MAY START INCURRING ALLOWABLE PROJECT COSTS, OF
4	COURSE, IT WOULD DO SO AT RISK, FROM THE DATE OF THE
5	APPLICATION SUBMISSION DEADLINE. CURRENTLY
6	APPLICANTS OR ULTIMATELY GRANTEES CANNOT INCUR COSTS
7	UNTIL AFTER THE BOARD APPROVAL. BY EXTENDING THIS
8	BACK TO THE DATE OF THE SUBMISSION DEADLINE, IT
9	ALLOWS PROJECTS TO BEGIN FASTER THAN THEY OTHERWISE
10	WOULD. AND CERTAINLY FOR PROMISING PROJECTS, THAT
11	WOULD BE AN ADVANTAGE FOR THEM. OF COURSE, ONCE
12	AGAIN, DOING SO WOULD BE AT THEIR OWN RISK BECAUSE
13	IF WE CANNOT OR DO NOT ULTIMATELY FUND IT, WE CAN'T
14	COVER THOSE COSTS.
15	SO THOSE ARE THE THREE REQUESTS TO YOU THE
16	BOARD, AND SO THAT IS THE CONCLUSION OF MY
17	PRESENTATION. DR. THOMAS.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. SAMBRANO.
19	WE'VE HEARD THE ASK HERE WITH ITS SUBPARTS. DO I
20	HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
21	DR. PRIETO: SO MOVED.
22	MS. WINOKUR: SECOND.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK DIANE WAS THE
24	SECOND.
25	MS. WINOKUR: YES.
	20

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. QUICKLY, I
2	JUST WANT TO CONFIRM THAT DAVID HIGGINS HAS JOINED
3	THE CALL.
4	MR. TORRES: I HAVE A QUESTION.
5	DR. HIGGINS: YES, MARIA, I'M HERE.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, SENATOR TORRES.
7	MR. TORRES: A QUESTION OF GILBERT. IN
8	READING OVER THE FDA MATERIAL, WHICH YOU DIDN'T
9	SUPPLY ME, BUT I DID MY OWN RESEARCH, IT SAYS THAT
10	THEY'RE CONSIDERING THREE PATHWAYS FOR CONVALESCENT
11	PLASMA. THE FIRST ONE BEING A CLINICAL TRIAL, THE
12	SECOND, EXPANDED ACCESS, AND THE THIRD BEING A
13	SINGLE-PATIENT EMERGENCY IND. DO WE HAVE ANY
14	INFORMATION OF WHERE THEY ARE ON ANY OF THESE THREE
15	APPROACHES?
16	MR. JUELSGAARD: I CAN SPEAK TO THAT. I
17	WAS JUST READING ACTUALLY AN FDA PRONOUNCEMENT THAT
18	CAME OUT, I THINK, THIS MORNING. AND YOU'RE
19	ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. BUT IT SAYS THE FDA SAYS THE
20	FOLLOWING PATHWAYS ARE AVAILABLE FOR ADMINISTERING
21	OR STUDYING THE USE OF COVID-19 CONVALESCENT PLASMA.
22	SO CLINICAL TRIALS, EXPANDED ACCESS, AND
23	SINGLE-PATIENT EMERGENCY IND.
24	MR. TORRES: STEVE, ON YOUR DOCUMENT, DOES
25	IT SHOW IF THEY'VE MOVED FORWARD ON ANY OF THOSE?

1	MR. JUELSGAARD: NO. IT JUST GIVES
2	GUIDANCE TO PEOPLE TO FILE AN IND AND GIVES THEM
3	THREE ALTERNATIVES.
4	MR. TORRES: OKAY. THANK YOU.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM
6	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
7	DR. DURON: I'M NOT SURE WHEN MY COMMENTS
8	ARE APPROPRIATE, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO SAY, NOT SURE
9	IF IT'S WRITTEN IN THE LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE, BUT WE
10	HAVE, I THINK, BOTH A MORAL AND ETHICAL DUTY TO ALL
11	THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA TO ENSURE WHATEVER WE FUND
12	AND WHATEVER KNOWLEDGE IS GAINED IS ACCESSED AND
13	PROVIDED TO ALL THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA.
14	WE ARE SEEING FROM THE DATA THERE'S AN
15	INCREASING AMOUNT OF DATA THAT SHOWS COMMUNITIES OF
16	COLOR AND RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS ARE FACING
17	DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACTS FROM THE PANDEMIC, BOTH
18	
	INFECTION AS WELL AS MORTALITY. THESE ARE MANY LOW
19	INFECTION AS WELL AS MORTALITY. THESE ARE MANY LOW  INCOME AND MIDDLE INCOME WORKERS WHO WORK IN SERVICE
19 20	
	INCOME AND MIDDLE INCOME WORKERS WHO WORK IN SERVICE
20	INCOME AND MIDDLE INCOME WORKERS WHO WORK IN SERVICE JOBS, AND THEY LIVE IN DENSE COMMUNITIES AND CROWDED
20 21	INCOME AND MIDDLE INCOME WORKERS WHO WORK IN SERVICE JOBS, AND THEY LIVE IN DENSE COMMUNITIES AND CROWDED HOMES. AND I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT
20 21 22	INCOME AND MIDDLE INCOME WORKERS WHO WORK IN SERVICE JOBS, AND THEY LIVE IN DENSE COMMUNITIES AND CROWDED HOMES. AND I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT WHATEVER WE DO, HOWEVER WE FUND, AND WHATEVER THE
20 21 22 23	INCOME AND MIDDLE INCOME WORKERS WHO WORK IN SERVICE JOBS, AND THEY LIVE IN DENSE COMMUNITIES AND CROWDED HOMES. AND I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT WHATEVER WE DO, HOWEVER WE FUND, AND WHATEVER THE RESULTS ARE, THAT WE BE REALLY ENGAGED IN MONITORING

1	I DON'T KNOW HOW WE DO THAT, HOW WE GAUGE
2	THAT, BUT I THINK THAT FUNDING CONCEPT AND RESEARCH
3	IS NOT GOOD ENOUGH. WE REALLY NEED TO KNOW THAT ALL
4	OF THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA ARE GOING TO GET SOME
5	SERVICE AS A RESULT OF THE FINDINGS, AND THEY NEED
6	TO KNOW THAT THEY ALL COUNT.
7	SO I'M HOPING THAT WE CAN BUILD THAT INTO,
8	EVEN AS WE ACCEPT THAT, THAT THE RESEARCHERS AND THE
9	INSTITUTIONS KNOW THAT THIS IS ABSOLUTELY SOMETHING
10	THAT WE BELIEVE IN AND WE EXPECT THEM TO ADHERE TO
11	IN TERMS OF ETHICS AND MORAL DECISION-MAKING.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL. VERY
13	IMPORTANT POINT.
14	MR. SHEEHY: CAN I ASK A QUESTION, J.T.?
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, JEFF, ALTHOUGH
16	MARIA IS SORT OF COLLECTING IN ORDER WHO'S GOT THEIR
17	HANDS RAISED. MARIA
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: I JUST KNOW THAT SOME
19	BOARD MEMBERS ARE USING THE RAISED HAND OPTION AND
20	SOME ARE NOT, WHICH IS FINE. WE CAN MANAGE IT. BUT
21	I KNOW THAT OS RAISED HIS HAND. I DON'T KNOW IF
22	IT'S BECAUSE HE WANTED ME TO REMIND PEOPLE OF THE
23	RAISED HAND OR IF HE HAD A COMMENT. I DON'T KNOW,
24	OS. AND THEN JEFF COMMENTS NEXT. OS, DO YOU HAVE
25	ANYTHING?

1	DR. STEWARD: ACTUALLY I DO. THANK YOU.
2	THIS IS A PROCEDURAL QUESTION, I GUESS,
3	AND IT MIGHT BE JUST AND IT IS RELATED TO THE
4	WHOLE PROCESS OF THE VRO, VOTING THIS PARTICULAR
5	APPROACH AS A VRO. THAT'S QUESTION NO. 1.
6	AND THEN QUESTION NO. 2 IS IS IT THE
7	PREROGATIVE OF CIRM, NOT THE BOARD, BUT CIRM, TO
8	MAKE A JUDGMENT ON OTHER THINGS THAT COME IN THAT WE
9	MAY NOT RECOGNIZE RIGHT NOW AS BEING POTENTIALLY
10	WITHIN THE VRO CONCEPT AND BEING ABLE TO FORWARD
11	THOSE TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IN A SENSE WITHOUT
12	PRIOR BOARD APPROVAL? I'M ASKING PROCESS HERE.
13	THANK YOU.
14	MR. HARRISON: SO TO YOUR LAST QUESTION,
15	THE BOARD ESTABLISHES ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA THROUGH
	THE CONCEPT PLANS THAT IT APPROVES. THE CIRM TEAM
16	THE CONCELL LEARS THAT IT ALTROVES. THE CIRCLE FEAT
	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN
17	
17 18	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN
17 18 19	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT AN APPLICATION FOR A
17 18 19 20	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN  DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT AN APPLICATION FOR A  PARTICULAR PROJECT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
17 18 19 20 21	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN  DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT AN APPLICATION FOR A  PARTICULAR PROJECT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE  CONCEPT PLAN. ON OCCASION THE PRESIDENT HAS
17 18 19 20 21	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN  DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT AN APPLICATION FOR A  PARTICULAR PROJECT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE  CONCEPT PLAN. ON OCCASION THE PRESIDENT HAS  EXERCISED HIS OR HER AUTHORITY TO GRANT AN EXCEPTION
17 18 19 20 21 22	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT AN APPLICATION FOR A PARTICULAR PROJECT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CONCEPT PLAN. ON OCCASION THE PRESIDENT HAS EXERCISED HIS OR HER AUTHORITY TO GRANT AN EXCEPTION TO ALLOW A PROJECT TO MOVE FORWARD. BUT IN THIS
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THEN ADMINISTERS THOSE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN  DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT AN APPLICATION FOR A  PARTICULAR PROJECT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE  CONCEPT PLAN. ON OCCASION THE PRESIDENT HAS  EXERCISED HIS OR HER AUTHORITY TO GRANT AN EXCEPTION  TO ALLOW A PROJECT TO MOVE FORWARD. BUT IN THIS  CASE, WHAT WE ARE DOING IS ASKING THE BOARD TO

1	REVIEWED ALONG WITH OTHER APPLICATIONS AND THE GWG
2	CAN CONSIDER WHETHER IN ITS VIEW IT CONSIDERS THE
3	APPLICATIONS TO PRESENT A VITAL RESEARCH
4	OPPORTUNITY. IF IT DOES, THEN THOSE APPLICATIONS
5	THEN PROCEED TO THE BOARD. IF IT DOES NOT, THEN THE
6	APPLICATIONS ARE DEEMED TO BE WITHDRAWN.
7	DR. STEWARD: THANK YOU.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF HAD A QUESTION AS
9	WELL AND THEN GEORGE BLUMENTHAL AFTER THAT.
10	MR. SHEEHY: I WANTED TO SPEAK TO MS.
11	DURON'S POINT. IT HAD BEEN MY HOPE WHEN I FIRST
12	HEARD ABOUT THIS THAT, AND MAYBE WE CAN MAKE AN
13	AMENDMENT TO DO THIS, THAT THERE WOULD BE A PRIORITY
14	GIVEN TO APPLICATIONS THAT WOULD SUPPLY THIS
15	TECHNOLOGY TO UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES OR CLINICS
16	THAT SERVE UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
17	WHEN YOU LOOK AT THIS TECHNOLOGY, IT FEELS
18	LIKE SOMETHING THAT UCSF OR UCLA MAY WELL ADOPT ON
19	THEIR OWN. BUT FOR OTHER CLINICS THAT ARE NOT
20	ATTACHED TO LARGE ACADEMIC RESEARCH CENTERS REALLY
21	ACCESSING THESE PROCESSES SEEMS LIKE IT WOULD BE
22	DAUNTING. AND IN THE CONTEXT OF, BECAUSE I DID SEE
23	THE INDIVIDUAL IND WHERE A TREATING PHYSICIAN COULD
24	CONTACT THE FDA AND WITHIN A MATTER OF HOURS GET
25	APPROVAL TO USE THESE CELLS OR TO USE THIS PLASMA TO

1	ACTUALLY SAVE A PATIENT'S LIFE, IF AN APPLICANT
2	WERE IF WE COULD INCENTIVIZE APPLICANTS WHO WANT
3	TO APPLY TO USE THIS TECHNOLOGY IN COVID TO REALLY
4	FOCUS ON THOSE COMMUNITY CLINICS THAT SERVE THOSE IN
5	CALIFORNIA THAT WOULD HAVE EITHER DELAY OR MAY NOT
6	EVEN HAVE ACCESS TO THIS TECHNOLOGY UNTIL MUCH, MUCH
7	LATER. I THINK THAT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL.
8	AND IF, PER MS. DURON'S POINT OF HOW WE
9	MIGHT DO THIS, I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST AN AMENDMENT
10	TO THIS PROPOSAL TO ENSURE THAT THE GRANTS WORKING
11	GROUP GIVES ADDITIONAL VALUE TO THE APPLICATION IF
12	IT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDES EXPANDING ACCESS TO
13	COMMUNITIES THAT MAYBE FHMC'S OR OTHER CLINIC
14	COMMUNITIES, OTHER CLINICAL PROGRAMS THAT REALLY
15	DON'T HAVE THE CONNECTIONS AND WOULD BE LESS LIKELY
16	TO ACCESS THIS TECHNOLOGY.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO, JEFF, YOU ARE
18	PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THAT EFFECT?
19	MR. SHEEHY: YES.
20	MR. TORRES: I'LL SECOND THAT.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.
22	DR. PRIETO: I WAS THE MAKER OF THE
23	MOTION. DO I NEED TO ACCEPT THAT AS A FRIENDLY
24	AMENDMENT?
25	MR. HARRISON: CORRECT. BOTH THE MAKER
	26

Í	·
1	AND THE SECOND WOULD NEED TO ACCEPT IT AS A FRIENDLY
2	AMENDMENT.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO AND DIANE?
4	DR. PRIETO: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE. DIANE, WILL YOU
6	ACCEPT THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?
7	MS. WINOKUR: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: GREAT. THANK YOU.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WHO WAS
10	MR. TORRES: TORRES WAS THE SECOND.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.
12	SO LET'S HAVE DISCUSSION ON THE FURTHER
13	BOARD DISCUSSION ON THE AMENDMENT FIRST.
14	DR. DULIEGE: CAN YOU REPEAT THE AMENDMENT
15	JUST SO THAT WE'RE ALL ON THE SAME PAGE?
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO, JAMES, YOU'RE ALWAYS
17	THE MOST SUCCINCT REPEATER OF MOTIONS HERE. HOW DO
18	YOU HAVE THIS RECORDED PER JEFF'S SUGGESTION?
19	MR. HARRISON: I WILL GIVE IT A SHOT, BUT
20	JEFF CAN CORRECT ME IF I DIDN'T CAPTURE IT IN ITS
21	ENTIRETY. SO THE MOTION WOULD BE TO APPROVE THE
22	CONCEPT PLAN AMENDMENT AS MODIFIED TO GRANT PRIORITY
23	TO APPLICATIONS THAT PROPOSE TO EXPAND ACCESS FOR
24	UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JEFF, DOES THAT SOUND
	27
	27

1	RIGHT?
2	MR. SHEEHY: I THINK SO. I DON'T KNOW.
3	FRANCISCO MIGHT HAVE SOME INSIGHT IN THIS. I JUST
4	WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE REALLY CAPTURING
5	GIVEN THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WITH THE
6	INDIVIDUAL IND, THIS CAN ACTUALLY BE SOMETHING THAT
7	CAN BE DELIVERED BY INDIVIDUAL CLINICS THAT WOULD
8	NEVER BE ABLE TO RECEIVE THIS. ANYBODY WHO'S A
9	PRACTICING PHYSICIAN, AND ART MIGHT HAVE A SENSE
10	SITTING ON COVER CALIFORNIA, DO WE NEED TO CALL OUT
11	A SPECIFIC LIKE AN FMHC OR SOMETHING THAT
12	ACTUALLY TO MAKE THAT WE'RE ACTUALLY SPECIFIC
13	CLINICAL PROGRAMS THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE
14	INCLUDED SO THAT WE REALLY DRIVE THE OUTREACH TO
15	THOSE CLINICAL PROGRAMS? THEY'RE NOT GOING TO COME
16	ON THEIR OWN, RIGHT. BECAUSE THEY'RE PROBABLY UP TO
17	THEIR NECK IN THIS ALREADY. THE DEGREE OF
18	SPECIFICITY. A LOT OF TIMES WE SAY THESE THINGS,
19	AND THEN THEY DON'T REALLY GET OPERATIONALIZED.
20	THERE'S LIKE THESE VAGUE KIND OF STATEMENTS. THE
21	MORE THAT WE COULD MORE PRECISELY DRIVE
22	INVESTIGATORS TO ACTUALLY REACH OUT TO THOSE CLINICS
23	AND MAKE SURE THAT THEY'RE AWARE AND HAVE PROCESSES
24	THAT WILL FACILITATE THEM ACCESSING THIS WOULD BE MY
25	HOPE.

1	DR. PRIETO: JEFF, IF I COULD COMMENT?
2	MR. SHEEHY: PLEASE.
3	DR. PRIETO: WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IN
4	TERMS OF CLINICAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES IS NOT JUST
5	UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES, BUT SPECIFICALLY
6	COMMUNITIES THAT ARE OR APPEAR TO BE MORE HEAVILY
7	IMPACTED OR DISPROPORTIONATELY SUFFERING THE MOST
8	SEVERE COMPLICATIONS OF THE DISEASE, OF THE
9	EPIDEMIC. I'M NOT SURE HOW WE WOULD PUT THAT IN THE
10	RESEARCH PROPOSAL OR THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, BUT
11	I THINK WE WOULD WANT TO ENCOURAGE APPLICANTS TO
12	REACH OUT TO THOSE POTENTIAL PATIENTS. I WOULD HOPE
13	THEY WOULD BE DOING THAT ANYWAYS BECAUSE THIS IS NOT
14	ONLY THE FOLKS WHO APPEAR TO BE MOST HEAVILY
15	IMPACTED, BUT ALSO WHERE ANY PROPOSED THERAPY WITH
16	CONVALESCENT PLASMA WOULD POTENTIALLY HAVE THE
17	GREATEST IMPACT. SO WHERE YOU'D BE MOST LIKELY TO
18	SEE A RESULT IF THAT'S POSSIBLE.
19	DR. ZIEDONIS: I THINK THE HOSPITALS ARE
20	TELLING EACH OTHER WHO HAS THE CASES. SO I THINK
21	ONE COULD LOOK THERE. I KNOW AT UCSD, BECAUSE WE
22	ALSO DO TESTING AND A VARIETY OF THINGS, WE ARE
23	SEEING A LOT OF THE PATIENTS. SO I THINK WE
24	PROBABLY JUST NEED SOMEBODY WHO'S ON THOSE STATEWIDE
25	CALLS. THE UC SYSTEM HAS A STATEWIDE CALL JUST

1	WITHIN ITS FIVE HEALTHCARE HOSPITAL-BASED PLACES.
2	BUT IF YOU DIDN'T WANT THAT AS A PRIORITY AND YOU
3	WANTED TO HAVE OTHER HOSPITALS AS A PRIORITY, I
4	THINK IT DEPENDS ON WHAT THE GOAL OF THIS BY ITSELF
5	IS.
6	I'D ALSO WANT TO KNOW THE INFRASTRUCTURE.
7	COULD SOMEBODY HANDLE THIS? IT'S NICE TO GET THEM
8	THIS, BUT MAKING SURE THAT THEY WANT IT AND THAT
9	THEY WOULD BE ABLE TO USE IT, I THINK, WOULD BE
10	IMPORTANT.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. BLUMENTHAL HAD HIS
12	HAND RAISED AS DOES OS. JUST WANTED TO CIRCLE BACK
13	TO THAT.
14	DR. BLUMENTHAL: I'M REALLY SPEAKING TO
15	THE MAIN MOTION RATHER THAN TO THE AMENDMENT, WHICH
16	I STRONGLY DO SUPPORT THE MAIN MOTION. I DO WITH
17	ONE CAVEAT. AND MY CAVEAT HAS TO DO WITH ALLOWING
18	CLINICAL PROGRAMS TO START INCURRING ALLOWABLE
19	PROJECT COSTS PRIOR TO THE APPROVAL OF THE PROGRAM,
20	BUT RATHER STARTING FROM THE APPLICATION SUBMISSION
21	DEADLINE. THAT RAISES SOME CONCERNS WITH ME,
22	CONCERNS ABOUT WHETHER THAT'S ACTUALLY LEGAL TO DO,
23	CONCERNS ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S EVER BEEN A
24	PRECEDENT FOR CIRM HAVING DONE THAT BEFORE, AND
25	CONCERNS ABOUT WHAT IS ACTUALLY THE JUSTIFICATION
	20

1	FOR DOING THAT GIVEN THE LIMITED BUDGET WE HAVE FOR
2	THESE GRANTS. COULD YOU ADDRESS THOSE QUESTIONS?
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. SAMBRANO OR DR.
4	MILLAN, WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADDRESS THAT QUESTION
5	PLEASE?
6	DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. I CAN SPEAK TO IT.
7	SO WE HAVE ACTUALLY DONE THIS BEFORE AND HAD THAT
8	AVAILABLE TO ALL OUR CLINICAL PROGRAMS. AND A
9	COUPLE OF YEARS AGO WE CHANGED IT IN ORDER TO WE
10	MOVED IT OVER TO AFTER APPROVAL BY THE BOARD. AND
11	THE REASON THAT WE RECONSIDERED IT IN THIS
12	PARTICULAR CASE IS WE WANTED, GIVEN THE URGENCY OF
13	MANY OF THESE PROJECTS THAT WANT TO GET STARTED, IS
14	TO ALLOW THEM TO INCUR COSTS WHICH WE WOULD
15	REIMBURSE LATER. SO A REIMBURSEMENT-BASED PAYMENT
16	IS NOT UNUSUAL. IT'S JUST REALLY UP TO THE FUNDING
17	ORGANIZATION WHETHER THEY'RE WILLING TO DO IT.
18	NOW, OF COURSE, IF AN APPLICATION COMES IN
19	AND IT DOESN'T GET FUNDED, THE APPLICANT IS
20	INCURRING COSTS AT RISK, MEANING THAT THEY HAVE TO
21	COVER THE COSTS. WE WOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO PAYING
22	THOSE. IT WOULD ONLY BE FOR THE CASE WHERE YOU HAVE
23	AN APPLICATION THAT GOES THROUGH, IT GETS APPROVED
24	AND FUNDED; AND THEN ONCE THEY GET THE MONEY FROM
25	US, THEY CAN USE THAT TO COVER THOSE COSTS.

1	DR. BLUMENTHAL: BUT IS IT YOUR SENSE THAT
2	THERE ARE PROJECTS THAT WOULDN'T EVEN BEGIN IF IT
3	WEREN'T FOR THIS PARTICULAR POINT?
4	DR. SAMBRANO: WELL, THERE ARE PROJECTS
5	THAT ARE WANTING TO START AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.
6	AND SO MANY OF THEM HAVE MONEY AVAILABLE THAT THEY
7	CAN UTILIZE TO BEGIN. SO THEY CAN CERTAINLY GET
8	STARTED OR AT LEAST START INCURRING THE COST EVEN
9	THOUGH THEY DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE TO PAY IT OUT.
10	BUT ULTIMATELY IT'S GOING TO BE THEIR RESPONSIBILITY
11	IF WE ARE NOT ABLE TO FUND THEM.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: I KNOW OS HAD HIS HAND UP
13	AND ART DOES AS WELL.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CAN I JUST THANK YOU,
15	DR. BLUMENTHAL, FOR THOSE COMMENTS. IF WE COULD
16	FIRST ADDRESS GOING FORWARD WITH THE AMENDMENT SO WE
17	CAN REACH RESOLUTION ON THAT AND THEN GO BACK TO
18	GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE OVERALL MOTION
19	THEREAFTER.
20	DR. STEWARD: THANK YOU. SO THIS IS
21	REGARDING THE DISCUSSION, I'M NOT SURE HOW TO
22	CAPTURE IT, BUT IT'S JEFF'S AMENDMENT. AND THIS IS
23	REALLY A QUESTION, I GUESS, FOR EVERYBODY. I'M A
24	LITTLE CONCERNED THAT MAKING THAT A REVIEW CRITERION
25	KIND OF TAKES IT OUT OF THE SCIENTIFIC REALM AND

1	ALSO GREATLY COMPLICATES THE REVIEW PROCESS. IS
2	THIS SOMETHING WE WANT THE GWG TO LOOK AT, OR IS
3	THIS SOMETHING THAT IS REALLY BETTER EVALUATED AT
4	THE BOARD LEVEL AFTER THE GWG HAS MADE ITS
5	SCIENTIFIC JUDGMENT? THANK YOU.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MR. SHEEHY, YOU WANT TO
7	COMMENT ON THAT?
8	MR. SHEEHY: SURE. YOU KNOW, I'M
9	SPECIFICALLY THINKING THERE'S BEEN A FAIRLY
10	SIGNIFICANT OUTBREAK, FOR INSTANCE, IN RIVERSIDE
11	COUNTY, IF YOU GUYS ARE WATCHING THE STATS. AND IT
12	KIND OF GOES ALSO TO THE COMMENT THAT WAS MADE ABOUT
13	WOULD PEOPLE WANT IT, WOULD THEY HAVE THE
14	INFRASTRUCTURE TO BE ABLE TO DO THIS. THE BIG
15	ACADEMIC RESEARCH CENTERS ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO DO
16	THIS. TO SOME DEGREE THEY'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO
17	HAVE RESOURCES IN ORDER TO DO THIS IN THE MAJOR
18	CITIES AND EVEN WITHIN MAJOR CITIES, IN CERTAIN
19	PARTS OF MAJOR CITIES. THE ASPECT OF THIS THAT
20	REALLY ALLOWS US TO EXPAND ACCESS IN A WAY THAT IN
21	MANY WAYS WITH CLINICAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS WE CAN'T.
22	IT'S THE INDIVIDUAL IND THAT, IF PHYSICIANS WERE
23	MADE AWARE OF THIS, IF THE APPLICANT HAD BEEN
24	THOUGHTFUL ABOUT MAKING PHYSICIANS AWARE OF THIS AND
25	HOSPITALS AWARE THAT THIS WAS AVAILABLE, IF THE WAY

1	THEY DESIGNED THEIR PROGRAM WAS TO PLACE THE MOST
2	MINIMUM BURDEN ON THOSE HOSPITALS AND THOSE CLINICAL
3	PROGRAMS IN DELIVERING THIS, THAT WOULD BE
4	SIGNIFICANT.
5	AND I JUST WORRY ABOUT THAT THIS WILL END
6	UP BEING SOMETHING THAT WILL GO TO A LOT OF VERY
7	WELL-ESTABLISHED ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS THAT
8	COULD POTENTIALLY IMPLEMENT THIS WITHOUT NEEDING
9	CIRM RESOURCES. AND THOSE OTHER CLINICAL PROGRAMS
10	THAT WE KNOW STRUGGLE TO GET RESOURCES, DON'T EVEN
11	HAVE THE RESOURCES OR THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO EVEN
12	THINK ABOUT THIS, ARE GOING TO BE LEFT OUT BECAUSE
13	THEY DON'T HAVE THE NAMES ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR
14	PROGRAM, THEY'RE NOT THE ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS
15	THAT TYPICALLY INSPIRE REVIEWERS TO AWARD THEIR
16	GRANTS. YOU ONLY HAVE TO LOOK AT HOW FUNDING HAS
17	BEEN DISTRIBUTED. AND THAT MAKES SENSE WHEN WE ARE
18	TALKING ABOUT VERY SOPHISTICATED STEM-CELL
19	TECHNOLOGIES, BUT THIS IS A RELATIVELY SIMPLE
20	TECHNOLOGY. AND FDA HAS GIVEN A REALLY SIMPLE AND
21	CLEAN PATHWAY TO DO THIS.
22	AND I THINK WE NEED TO PUSH, OR ELSE WE'LL
23	END UP WITH THE USUAL SUSPECTS GETTING THE MONEY.
24	AND TO THE DEGREE THAT THEY ACTUALLY SOME OF
25	THOSE PROGRAM A LOT OF THE INSTITUTIONS ADMIRABLY

1	DO SERVE UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES. BUT I FEEL LIKE
2	IF WE'RE GOING TO REALLY GET OUTSIDE OF OUR USUAL
3	FUNDING TARGETS, THAT IT'S INCUMBENT ON US TO MAKE
4	SURE THAT WE MAKE THIS ACCESSIBLE IN THE BROADEST
5	POSSIBLE WAY, WHICH, FRANKLY, IS THE GREATEST NEED
6	RIGHT NOW.
7	DR. STEWARD: JUST A COUPLE THOUGHTS, IF I
8	COULD. I'M NOT ARGUING THE CONCEPT. I'M JUST
9	ASKING WHERE IT SHOULD BE REVIEWED.
10	MR. SHEEHY: WELL, IT'S NOT GOING TO GET
11	OUT OF GWG WITH A GOOD SCORE. SO THAT KILLS IT
12	RIGHT THERE.
13	DR. MARTIN: LET ME JUST REMIND PEOPLE
14	THAT THIS IS NOT A SIMPLE CLINICAL TRIAL BECAUSE THE
15	PLASMA OR SERA CANNOT BE INFECTIOUS, NOT JUST FOR
16	THE CORONA VIRUS, BUT HIV, FOR EXAMPLE. AND I DON'T
17	KNOW WHAT THE REGULATIONS ARE GOING TO BE COMING
18	FROM THE FDA TO QUALIFY ALL THE VARIOUS SERA THAT
19	ARE GOING TO BE USED, BUT IT'S NOT SIMPLE.
20	MR. SHEEHY: WELL, THE THING IS WE HAVE
21	FUNDED THROUGH OUR ALPHA CLINIC PROGRAM VERY
22	SOPHISTICATED CELL HANDLING. THAT'S PART OF WHAT
23	THEY DO. AND IT'D REALLY BE GREAT IF WE COULD
24	REPURPOSE THAT TO HANDLE THESE PRODUCTS. I THINK
25	THAT THEY COULD EASILY THIS IS WHAT THEY DO ALL

1	THE TIME VALIDATE THESE PRODUCTS IN A WAY THAT
2	MAKE THEM SAFE TO USE. AND ALL I'M TRYING TO ASK IS
3	THAT IF THEY GET ENGAGED WITH THIS AND THEY'RE DOING
4	THIS, THAT THEY REACH OUT TO HOSPITALS AND CLINICS
5	THAT ARE NOT NECESSARILY ALWAYS ASSOCIATED WITH
6	THESE ALPHA CLINICS.
7	MR. ROWLETT: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT
8	PLEASE.
9	MR. TORRES: I'VE HAD MY HAND UP FOR A
10	WHILE NOW.
11	MR. ROWLETT: I'M ON THE PHONE. I DIDN'T
12	SEE IT, SENATOR.
13	MR. TORRES: GO AHEAD, AL. I'LL FOLLOW
14	YOU.
15	MR. ROWLETT: AS AN ADVOCATE WHO HAS THE
16	OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH THE UNSERVED AND
17	UNDERSERVED POPULATION JEFF IS ADVOCATING FOR, I
18	CERTAINLY, WITHOUT TALKING ABOUT THE SCIENTIFIC
19	MOTTLING OF THIS, WOULD BE AN ADVOCATE FOR AS BROAD
20	OF A CONSIDERATION IN ANY APPLICATION OF THOSE
21	COMMUNITIES AS POSSIBLE. IT IS UNFORTUNATE FOR MANY
22	CITIZENS THAT THEY GET RECOGNITION OF THE IMPACT OF
23	THE DISEASE WHEN THEY ARE VERY SYMPTOMATIC, VERY ILL
24	BECAUSE OF SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT JEFF IS IMPLYING
25	IN HIS POINT. AND SO TO THAT, I ENTHUSIASTICALLY

1	AGREE. WE NEED APPLICATIONS THAT TAKE THAT INTO			
2	CONSIDERATION. HOW THAT GETS CONSTRUCTED OR HOW			
3	THAT GETS REVIEWED CERTAINLY IS INCUMBENT UPON THE			
4	GWG AND THE APPLICATION. BUT THE INFERENCE THAT			
5	JEFF HAS MADE I AGREE WITH COMPLETELY.			
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SENATOR TORRES.			
7	MR. TORRES: I WANT TO REITERATE FOR THE			
8	PERSON THAT BROUGHT UP THIS INITIALLY, WHICH WAS			
9	YSABEL, BECAUSE SHE'S VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE GROUPS			
10	THAT ARE OUT THERE AS IS JEFF. I THINK WHAT NEEDS			
11	TO HAPPEN IS THAT THE APPLICANTS NEED TO KNOW THAT			
12	THIS IS THE SENSE OF THE BOARD, THAT IF YOU ARE			
13	GOING TO RECEIVE A GRANT, AND ALL THESE GRANTS HAVE			
14	TO BE BASED UPON SCIENTIFIC MERIT, ONCE THAT			
15	DECISION IS MADE, THEN WE HAVE TO HAVE A VERY FRANK			
16	DISCUSSION WITH WHOEVER THE APPLICANTS ARE THAT HAVE			
17	WON THE FUNDING OR GAINED THE FUNDING THAT			
18	ACCESSIBILITY IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US.			
19	LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE. I STARTED			
20	LOOKING INTO LAST YEAR HOW MANY NATIVE AMERICANS			
21	WERE IN OUR CURRENT CLINICAL TRIALS. IT WAS			
22	EMBARRASSING. VERY, VERY FEW. AND SO I REACHED OUT			
23	TO THE TRIBES AND I REACHED OUT TO THE APPLICANTS			
24	THAT HAD ACCESS OR AT LEAST THOSE THAT HAD AT LEAST			
25	ONE NATIVE AMERICAN PATIENT IN A CLINICAL TRIAL TO			

1	DO MORE.
2	JEFF RAISED RIVERSIDE. THAT'S A VERY
3	IMPORTANT GEOGRAPHIC AREA FOR WHERE COVID-19 IS
4	INCREASING BECAUSE IT'S A POOR AREA, WORKING CLASS
5	AREA, AND A LOT OF BROWN AND BLACK FOLK LIVE IN
6	THOSE COMMUNITIES. WE WHAT WE DO AT COVER
7	CALIFORNIA IS TO REACH OUT TO THE THIRD-PARTY PAYERS
8	TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY KNOW WHAT WE ARE ASKING FOR.
9	IN THIS CASE, I THINK ONCE THE APPLICANTS ARE
10	APPROVED, THEN WE NEED TO HAVE A VERY FRANK
11	DISCUSSION IN TERMS OF THAT WE'RE GOING TO EXPECT
12	THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS TO US AS TO WHERE THEY
13	GO. FOR EXAMPLE, UCSF HAS A WORKING PARTNERSHIP AND
14	PRESENCE IN FRESNO. THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT
15	ELEMENT, AS FRANCISCO, I KNOW, TRIED TO POINT OUT,
16	AND THAT IS RURAL CALIFORNIA IS ALWAYS THE LAST ONE
17	TO GET BENEFITS OF ANYTHING IN THE STATE. AND I
18	THINK ACCESSIBILITY TO HEALTHCARE HAS ALWAYS BEEN A
19	PROBLEM IN THOSE AREAS.
20	SO I THINK THAT IF UCSF WERE TO APPLY AND
21	THEY ARE LUCKY TO GET A GRANT, THEN WE NEED TO MAKE
22	SURE THAT THEY PARTICIPATE WITH FRESNO WHERE THEY
23	HAVE A PRESENCE ALREADY, AND I KNOW DIRECTOR PADILLA
24	KNOWS THIS, THAT THEY MOVE FORWARD IN THAT. THE
25	SAME THING IS TRUE WITH RIVERSIDE, TO MAKE SURE OUR

1	BOARD MEMBER AND DEAN OF OUR MEDICAL SCHOOL THERE IS			
2	AWARE OF A GRANT THAT MAY HAVE BEEN GRANTED FROM AN			
3	AREA THAT NEEDS ATTENTION FROM US.			
4	SO THE PRINCIPLES OF PROP 71, WHICH ALWAYS			
5	ATTRACTED ME TO THE LANGUAGE, WAS ACCESSIBILITY WAS			
6	GOING TO BE, AND CLEARLY EVEN ACCESSIBILITY TO THOSE			
7	THAT DID NOT HAVE HEALTH INSURANCE. THIS HAS TO BE			
8	THE PRIORITY FOR US. OTHERWISE, WE'RE FAILING THE			
9	DIVERSITY OF THE STATE IN TERMS OF ITS ACCESS TO			
10	HEALTHCARE AND CLEARLY TO TREATMENTS AND CURES. SO			
11	I THINK ONCE THE DECISIONS ARE MADE BY THE WORKING			
12	GROUP, WHICH WAS BASED ON SCIENTIFIC MERIT, THAT'S			
13	WHEN WE HAVE A VERY COME-TO-JESUS DISCUSSION. AND			
14	ON GOOD FRIDAY THAT'S NOT A BAD PHRASE TO USE IN			
15	DISCUSSION WHERE THEY NEED TO GO AND HOW TO PROVIDE			
16	THAT OUTREACH. AND CERTAINLY YSABEL, MYSELF, JEFF,			
17	AND OTHERS ON THE BOARD, AL, FRANCISCO, DIRECTOR			
18	PADILLA KNOW EXACTLY WHERE TO DIRECT US. SO THAT'S			
19	NOT GOING TO BE A HARD ALTERNATIVE TO IMPLEMENT. SO			
20	THAT'S WHY I SUPPORT WHAT YSABEL AND JEFF ARE TRYING			
21	TO DO AND CLEARLY AL AND FRANCISCO BECAUSE WE NEED			
22	TO MOVE FORWARD ON THIS.			
23	DR. DURON: MAY I COMMENT? I DON'T WANT			
24	TO STEP ON ANYBODY.			
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA HAD HER HAND			
	20			

1	RAISED AND THEN WE CAN GO TO YSABEL.
2	DR. VUORI: THANKS, MARIA. SO JUST
3	QUICKLY, I ABSOLUTELY AGREE WITH WHAT EVERYBODY HAS
4	SAID. I SPECIFICALLY AGREE WITH WHAT DAVE MARTIN
5	SAID JUST A LITTLE WHILE EARLIER. THIS IS NOT A
6	TRIVIAL TREATMENT THAT IS READY FOR PRIME TIME. IT
7	WILL INVOLVE RESEARCH AND TRIAL AND ERROR MOST
8	LIKELY. SO WHAT MY RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE IS THAT
9	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOCUSES ON THE SCIENTIFIC
10	MERIT, BUT AT THE SAME TIME, WE WILL ASK EVERY
11	APPLICANT TO OUTLINE HOW THEY WILL SPECIFICALLY
12	ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THE UNDERSERVED POPULATION IN
13	CALIFORNIA. AND THAT THEN THERE BE A CONVERSATION
14	THAT THE ICOC TAKES AND ESSENTIALLY PROGRAMMATICALLY
15	PRIORITIZE THESE APPLICATIONS HOW THEY WISH.
16	DR. DURON: AM I UP?
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KRISTINA.
18	DR. DURON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I HAVE
19	NEVER BEEN AGAINST SCIENTIFIC MERIT. BUT I'M ALSO
20	OPEN TO EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDING WHAT'S AT STAKE AND
21	WHEN IT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THEM TO START CONSIDERING
22	THIS. SO I THINK THAT IT'S ALMOST TOO LATE FOR
23	ANYBODY TO COME BACK OUT OF THE ICOC AND START
24	SAYING, WELL, YOU'VE GOT TO MAKE THIS A BETTER
25	PROPOSAL AND IT'S GOT TO BE INCLUSIVE. I THINK THAT

1	GOING INTO THE APPLICATION PROCESS, THEY SHOULD
2	ALREADY KNOW HOW IT IS THEY NEED TO CONSIDER MAKING
3	SURE THAT THERE'S PARITY AND INCLUSION OF THESE
4	UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS WITHIN THAT APPLICATION.
5	OTHERWISE, THERE'S A LOT OF ASSUMPTION ON OUR PART
6	AND ON MANY GROUPS' PARTS THEY'LL DO THE RIGHT THING
7	OR THAT WE CAN PUSH THEM INTO DOING THE RIGHT THING.
8	THERE IS THE REASON FOR PATIENT ADVOCACY
9	BECAUSE WE HAVE ASKED TIME AFTER TIME AFTER TIME FOR
10	CHANGE AND INCLUSION AND PARITY; BUT WITHOUT THE
11	PROPER POINTS MADE IN THE APPLICATION PROCESS, TO
12	COME AFTERWARDS AND SAY COULD YOU CHANGE THIS OR
13	WOULD YOU IMPROVE THIS IS THE TIME WHEN THERE'S A
14	LOT OF, I THINK, UNNECESSARY DICKERING, IF YOU WILL,
15	BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN WHAT IS AN ACCEPTABLE NUMBER
16	OR WHAT DOES THAT MEAN, WHAT IS DIVERSITY. I JUST
17	THINK THAT WE NEED TO INCLUDE IT FROM THE VERY
18	BEGINNING IN THE APPLICATION, STATEMENTS MADE,
19	EXPECTATIONS MADE, DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE POPULATIONS
20	YOU WILL RESEARCH, HOW YOU WILL MAKE SURE IT'S
21	PROPORTIONAL AND INCLUSIVE.
22	BUT BEYOND THAT, I THINK THAT I KNOW
23	THAT YOU'VE HAD IT SET UP FOR THE REVIEW TO BE FOR
24	SCIENTIFIC MERIT. I SAT ON THE CALIFORNIA RESEARCH
25	PROGRAM FOR BREAST CANCER, AND WE WERE AS PART OF

1	THE BOARD WE REVIEWED AS PATIENT ADVOCATES AT THE			
2	SAME TIME BECAUSE SOMETIMES SCIENTIFIC MERIT IS NOT			
3	JUST THE ONLY THING ONE SHOULD BE LOOKING AT.			
4	SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT AT THAT POINT IN			
5	TIME YOU ALSO NEED TO HAVE SOME PATIENT ADVOCATES BE			
6	LOOKING AT THOSE GRANTS AS WELL TO HAVE SOME THINGS			
7	TO SAY. BUT I REALLY DO THINK THAT THE INSTITUTIONS			
8	AND RESEARCH APPLICANTS GOING IN SHOULD ALREADY KNOW			
9	THAT THERE'S AN EXPECTATION OF INCLUSIVITY AND			
10	PARITY THAT THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO BE AIMING FOR. AND			
11	LATER YOU CAN DISCUSS WHAT THEIR PLANS ARE TO			
12	DISSEMINATE AND SHARE, ET CETERA, ET CETERA.			
13	BUT I THINK THEY NEED TO KNOW AND THAT THE			
14	REVIEW BOARD IS ACTUALLY ALSO INCLUDING IN THEIR			
15	POINT STRUCTURE, HOWEVER THEY ASSESS IT, THAT THEY			
16	LOOK SPECIFICALLY FOR HOW THEY HAVE RESPONDED IN			
17	THEIR APPLICATION TO THAT KIND OF THING. THAT IS AS			
18	IMPORTANT TO ME AS SCIENTIFIC MERIT. THANK YOU.			
19	MR. TORRES: I AGREE WITH THAT, AND I			
20	THINK THAT DR. SAMBRANO CAN CERTAINLY INCLUDE THAT			
21	IN ANY APPLICATION THAT GOES OUT AND THAT THE REVIEW			
22	BOARD LOOKS AT IT VERY CAREFULLY AS WELL AND THEN WE			
23	FOLLOW UP.			
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS HAD HIS			
25	HAND RAISED.			
	43			

1	DR. HIGGINS: THANKS. JUST A QUICK			
2	COMMENT TO ADD. I THINK MOST PEOPLE KNOW THAT DOWN			
3	HERE IN SAN DIEGO I FOCUS ON A VARIETY OF MEDICAL			
4	CARE, MEDICAL SERVICES TO THE UNDERMET POPULATIONS			
5	IN THE SOUTH BAY. SO I VERY MUCH APPRECIATE THE			
6	VALUE OF FOCUSING ON THAT.			
7	WHAT I WANTED TO SAY WAS JUST THAT I AGREE			
8	WITH OS AND JEFF, THAT THIS NEEDS TO BE PART OF THE			
9	EVALUATION. WHAT I JUST WANTED TO PUT MY TWO CENTS			
10	WORTH ON IS I DON'T THINK IT SHOULD BE PART OF THE			
11	GWG ANALYSIS. I THINK IT SHOULD EITHER BE BEFORE			
12	THAT IN AN AD HOC COMMITTEE OR, AS ART WAS			
13	SUGGESTING, AFTER THAT IN THE ICOC REVIEW. BUT			
14	THERE SHOULD BE SPECIFIC CRITERIA GIVEN TO THE GRANT			
15	APPLICANTS EARLY, BUT I WOULD NOT HAVE THE GWG DO			
16	THE EVALUATION FOR THIS PARTICULAR ASPECT. THAT'S			
17	ALL. THANKS.			
18	MR. SHEEHY: COULD I RESPOND UNLESS I'M			
19	JUMPING IN FRONT OF PEOPLE? I JUST WANT TO NOTE WE			
20	HAVE PRECEDENT FOR THIS. WHEN WE DO OUR TRAINING			
21	PROGRAMS, WE SPECIFICALLY REQUIRE THE APPLICANTS AND			
22	SCORE THE APPLICANTS BASED ON INCLUSION. AND I			
23	THINK THAT THE GWG IS EQUIPPED TO BE ABLE TO DEAL			
24	WITH THAT. THIS IS NOT THE FIRST TIME WE'VE ASKED			
25	PEOPLE TO DO THAT.			
	42			

1	MR. TORRES: CORRECT. CALL FOR THE			
2	QUESTION.			
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ALL RIGHT. QUESTION HAS			
4	BEEN CALLED FOR. WE WILL SEE NOW DO WE HAVE ANY			
5	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?			
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: HOLD FOR ONE SECOND. LET			
7	ME CHECK IN WITH DOUG. IF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC			
8	THAT HAVE DIALED IN WOULD LIKE TO MAKE COMMENT,			
9	PLEASE DIAL STAR NINE.			
10	MR. GUILLEN: WE HAVE TWO SO FAR.			
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: TWO. WE HAVE TWO HANDS			
12	THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. SO			
13	WE'RE GOING TO START WITH THOSE. PLEASE REMEMBER			
14	THE THREE-MINUTE TIME ALIGNMENT. THANK YOU.			
15	DR. ZAIA: THIS IS JOHN ZAIA FROM CITY OF			
16	HOPE. THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY. TO BE			
17	TRANSPARENT, I HAVE MORE OR LESS PUSHED FOR THIS			
18	IDEA THAT CIRM DO SOMETHING IMMEDIATELY. AND THE			
19	USE OF CONVALESCENT PLASMA FROM COVID CONVALESCENT			
20	PATIENTS IS ONE SUCH WAY TO DO IT. THE QUESTIONS			
21	THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED ARE REALLY GOOD ONES. HOW TO			
22	OPERATIONALIZE IT, BECAUSE THE REAL COMPLEXITY IS			
23	THAT YOU CAN FIND THE DONOR AND YOU CAN FIND THE			
24	PATIENT, BUT BEING ABLE TO DETERMINE IF THE PATIENT			
25	IS NOT INFECTIOUS AND HAS THE RIGHT ANTIBODY LEVELS			

1	THAT THE FDA HAS RECOMMENDED IS THE DIFFICULTY.			
2	THE COLLECTION CENTERS DON'T HAVE THE			
3	ABILITY TO HAVE A QUANTITATIVE ANTIBODY TEST, NOR DO			
4	THEY HAVE THE SWABS AND THE MOLECULAR DIAGNOSTIC			
5	TESTS THAT ARE AVAILABLE USING A PUBLIC HEALTH ARENA			
6	OR SOME MAJOR HOSPITAL. SO IT IS POSSIBLE TO CREATE			
7	A CIRM-FUNDED TESTING CENTER THAT WOULD BE ABLE TO			
8	PROVIDE ITS SERVICES, NOT ONLY TO THE MAJOR CENTERS			
9	LIKE THE UC'S, AND I HAVE TALKED TO THE UC'S AND			
10	THERE IS, I THINK, SOME DEGREE OF INTEREST IN HAVING			
11	A TESTING SERVICE THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR			
12	EVERYBODY.			
13	HOW WOULD YOU GET IT TO THE SITES THAT ARE			
14	NOT IN THE UC SYSTEM AND ARE UNDERSERVED AREAS? YOU			
15	COULD PROPOSE THAT A WEB-BASED SYSTEM WOULD ALLOW A			
16	PERSON TO LOG ON, REGISTER THEMSELVES, THEY CAN GET			
17	INFORMATION ABOUT HOW TO DO THE E-IND, AND HOW TO			
18	SEND THE SPECIMENS ON THEIR DONOR THEY HAVE TO			
19	IDENTIFY THEIR OWN DONOR TO YOU, TO THIS TESTING			
20	CENTER, RECEIVE THE RESULTS, AND THEN BRING THAT TO			
21	THE COLLECTION CENTER NEARBY.			
22	WE HAVE TALKED TO SEVERAL COLLECTION			
23	CENTERS WHO SAY THE PROBLEM THEY HAVE IS EXACTLY			
24	THAT, HOW TO QUALIFY THE DONORS. SO THERE ARE WAYS			
25	TO DO THIS. AND I ENCOURAGE THE BOARD TO APPROVE A			

1	PROGRAM SUCH AS THAT DESCRIBED EARLIER. THANK YOU
2	VERY MUCH.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. ZAIA.
4	WHO'S OUR SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT?
5	MR. BEHN: THIS IS BILL BEHN JUST WITH A
6	COMMENT. THERE MIGHT BE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE FDA
7	TO LEND THEIR SPECIFICATIONS ABOUT WHAT SHOULD BE
8	INCLUDED IN PATIENT AVAILABILITY. EARLIER THERE WAS
9	A REFERENCE TO THE LETTER THAT CAME OUT FROM THE FDA
10	ON APRIL 8TH. IT HAS A SHORT DISCUSSION ABOUT
11	PATIENT ELIGIBILITY WHICH DOES NOT MENTION ANYTHING
12	RELATIVE TO INCLUSIVENESS. AND AS WITH MOST FDA
13	DOCUMENTS, IT HAS A MUCH MORE DETAILED GUIDANCE
14	THAT'S REFERENCED IN THAT. SO THERE MAY BE A WAY
15	JUST TO HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH THE FDA ABOUT THIS
16	SPECIFICALLY AND HOW THAT COULD BE USED AS A WAY TO
17	ENCOURAGE INCLUSION IN THE ACTUAL RESEARCH THAT'S
18	FUNDED. THAT'S ALL I HAVE.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ARE THERE
20	OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: NO, THERE ARE NOT.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
23	HEARING NONE, WE'RE GOING TO BE FIRST VOTING ON THE
24	AMENDMENT. WE'VE HAD A VERY GOOD
25	MR. TORRES: A POINT OF ORDER. THE

1	AMENDMENT WAS MADE WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER			
2	WITH THE ORIGINAL MOTION AND THE SECOND, SO WE			
3	SHOULD BE VOTING ON THE MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED.			
4	MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT.			
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. SO THE			
6	DISCUSSION HAS BEEN VERY GOOD. THERE'S STILL SOME			
7	OPEN ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN THE COURSE			
8	OF THE DISCUSSION THAT ARE GOING TO HAVE TO BE			
9	WORKED OUT WITH RESPECT TO WHAT'S GOING TO BE			
10	CONSIDERED BY THE GWG, WHAT THE DIRECTIONS ARE GOING			
11	TO BE TO THE GWG, ALL OF THAT SORT OF THING, WHICH,			
12	IF THIS MOTION PASSES, WILL REQUIRE FURTHER			
13	DISCUSSION. SO IN ANY EVENT, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE			
14	CALL THE ROLL ON THE MOTION AS AMENDED.			
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: I SURE WILL.			
16	GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.			
17	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.			
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.			
19	DR. BOXER: YES.			
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEN BURTIS.			
21	DR. BURTIS: YES.			
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.			
23	DR. DULIEGE: YES.			
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.			
25	MS. DURON: YES.			
	47			
	٦,			

1	MS	. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.
2	DR	. FINE: YES.
3	MS	. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
4	DR	. GASSON: YES.
5	MS	. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
6	MR	. JUELSGAARD: YES.
7	MS	. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
8	DR	. MALKAS: YES.
9	MS	. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. ADRIANA
10	PADILLA.	
11	DR	. PADILLA: YES.
12	MS	. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
13	MR	. PANETTA: YES.
14	MS	. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
15	DR	. PRIETO: AYE.
16	MS	. BONNEVILLE: ROBERT QUINT.
17	DR	. QUINT: YES.
18	MS	. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
19	MR	. ROWLETT: YES.
20	MS	. BONNEVILLE: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
21	DR	. SANDMEYER: YES.
22	MS	. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
23	MR	. SHEEHY: YES.
24	MS	. BONNEVILLE: OSWALD STEWARD.
25	DR	. STEWARD: YES.
		48
		• •

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
4	MR. TORRES: AYE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
6	DR. VUORI: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
8	MS. WINOKUR: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
10	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: DOUG ZIEDONIS.
12	DR. ZIEDONIS: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, EVERYBODY,
15	FOR THAT. I THINK THAT LATTER DISCUSSION WAS
16	EXCEPTIONALLY IMPORTANT AND REALLY GETS TO THE CORE
17	OF WHAT CIRM IS ALL ABOUT AND PROP 71 IS ALL ABOUT.
18	SO I THINK WE SHOULD FEEL VERY GOOD ABOUT THIS GOING
19	FORWARD. WE JUST NEED TO MAKE SURE WE IMPLEMENT IT
20	IN THE BEST POSSIBLE WAY.
21	WE ARE NOW AT THE PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ANY
22	ITEMS
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE HAVE ONE MORE ITEM.
24	IT'S THE ADDITIONS
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, THANK YOU, MARIA.
	49

1	ITEM 6, APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT OF SCIENTIFIC			
2	MEMBERS TO THE GWG. DR. SAMBRANO.			
3	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, DR. THOMAS. SO			
4	AS BEFORE, WE ARE CONTINUING OUR QUEST FOR EXPERTS			
5	IN THE AREA OF COVID-19 AND RELATED AREAS. SO WE			
6	ARE BRINGING TWO NOMINATIONS AS WELL AS SOME			
7	REAPPOINTMENTS OF GWG MEMBERS. AND SO THOSE BIOS			
8	WERE PROVIDED TO YOU. THE NEW MEMBERS ARE DR.			
9	CHANNAPPANAVAR, WHO IS A VIRAL IMMUNOLOGIST AT UT			
10	SOUTHWESTERN IN TEXAS, AND DR. GORDON RUBENFELD, WHO			
11	IS IN TORONTO WITH EXPERTISE IN TRAUMA, EMERGENCY,			
12	AND CRITICAL CARE WITH EXPERIENCE WITH ACUTE			
13	RESPIRATORY DISTRESS SYNDROME AND ACUTE LUNG INJURY.			
14	THE PROPOSED REAPPOINTMENTS ARE FOR DR.			
15	ADRIAN GEE, DR. JAMES GUEST, AND DR. MICHELLE			
16	WILLIAMS. SO WE REQUEST APPOINTMENT AND			
17	REAPPOINTMENT OF THESE INDIVIDUALS.			
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A MOTION TO			
19	THAT EFFECT?			
20	DR. GASSON: SO MOVED.			
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECOND?			
22	DR. HIGGINS: I'LL SECOND IT.			
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.			
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF			
25	THE BOARD? HEARING NONE, DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF			

1 THE PUBLIC? OKAY. AS WITH OUR CALL TWO WEEKS AGO,	
THIS IS NORMALLY A VOICE VOTE; BUT SINCE WE'RE ALL	
REMOTE, WE NEED TO DO THIS IN A ROLL CALL VOTE.	
4 MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.	
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.	
6 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.	
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.	
8 DR. BOXER: YES.	
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: KEN BURTIS.	
10 DR. BURTIS: YES.	
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.	
DR. DULIEGE: YES.	
MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.	
14 MS. DURON: YES.	
MS. BONNEVILLE: LEON FINE.	
DR. FINE: YES.	
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.	
DR. GASSON: YES.	
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.	
DR. HIGGINS: YES.	
MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.	
MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.	
MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.	
DR. MALKAS: YES.	
MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. ADRIANA	
51	

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

	_	·
1	PADILLA.	
2		DR. PADILLA: YES.
3		MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
4		MR. PANETTA: YES.
5		MS. BONNEVILLE: FRANCISCO PRIETO. ROBERT
6	QUINT.	
7		DR. QUINT: YES.
8		MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
9		MR. ROWLETT: YES.
10		MS. BONNEVILLE: SUZANNE SANDMEYER.
11		DR. SANDMEYER: YES.
12		MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
13		MR. SHEEHY: YES.
14		MS. BONNEVILLE: OSWALD STEWARD.
15		DR. STEWARD: YES.
16		MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
17		CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
18		MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
19		MR. TORRES: AYE.
20		MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
21		DR. VUORI: YES.
22		MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR.
23		MS. WINOKUR: YES.
24		MS. BONNEVILLE: KEITH YAMAMOTO. DOUG
25	ZIEDONIS.	
		52
		JL

1	DR. ZIEDONIS: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, EVERYONE. THE
3	MOTION CARRIES.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. NOW
5	WE ARE AT PUBLIC COMMENT. ANY COMMENTS BY MEMBERS
6	OF THE PUBLIC ON ANY TOPIC THEY WISH TO DISCUSS AT
7	THIS POINT?
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: NONE.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. HEARING
10	NONE, I JUST WANT TO SAY TO EVERYBODY STAY SAFE AND
11	HEALTHY. I WOULD LIKE TO ADJOURN TODAY'S MEETING IN
12	THE MEMORY OF GLORIA REED, DON'S WIFE, WHO VERY
13	SADLY PASSED AWAY EARLIER THIS WEEK. GLORIA, AS YOU
14	KNOW, WAS A WONDERFUL FRIEND TO CIRM AND A MAJOR
15	SUPPORTER SINCE THE INCEPTION OF THE AGENCY. WANT
16	TO PASS ON BEHALF OF CIRM TO DON, I'M SURE YOU'RE
17	LISTENING, THAT OUR DEEPEST CONDOLENCES TO YOU AND
18	THE FAMILY AT THIS TIME. AND WE ARE, AS ALWAYS,
19	HERE FOR YOU GOING FORWARD.
20	SO WITH THAT, PLEASE, EVERYBODY, AGAIN
21	STAY SAFE AND HEALTHY UNTIL WE TALK AGAIN. WE STAND
22	ADJOURNED.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, EVERYONE, FOR
24	GETTING THIS TOGETHER. SO THANK YOU.
25	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 12:20 P.M.)

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING ZOOM MEETING TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS EMERGENCY MEETING HELD ON APRIL 10, 2020, 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 TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152 133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO (208) 255-5453